Rich. Baxter's

ADMONITION

TO

Mr *WILLIAM EYRE*

OF

SALISBURY;

Concerning his

MISCARRIAGES

in a Book lately Written for the

Justification of Infidels,

AGAINST

M. *Benj. Woodbridge*, M. *James Cranford* and the Author.

---

2 Pet. 2. 19. *While they promise them Liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption.*

Rom. 4. 22, 23, 24. *And* therefore *it was imputed to him for Righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was Imputed to him: But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we Believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.*

Ostendisti tales Discipulos, non *fecisti*: Hoc profecit doctrina tua, ut Peccatum ne Pœnitentiam quidem habeat. *Hieronym.* contr. *Jovinian.* lib. 2. pag. *(mihi)* 43.

LONDON,

Printed by *A. M.* for *Thomas Underhill*, at the Anchor and Bible in *Pauls* Church-yard near the little North-door, and *Francis Tyton*, at the three Daggers in Fleetstreet near *Dunstans* Church. 1654.

ADMONITION

TO

ALL THE BURY

OF

MISCARRIAGES

IN THE

Publication of Bridels,

AGAINST

and the Author of.

The Preface.

READER;

I Think it not inconvenient to give thee ſome advertiſement of the occaſion of this writing. Having met with a Sermon of Mr *B. Woodbridge* Paſtor of *Newbury*, for Juſtification by faith, and againſt the Juſtification of Infidels, I ſaw ſo much worth in a narrow room, which cauſed me to bleſs God that his Church had ſuch a man, and eſpecially *Newbury* who had ſo excellently learned a Paſtor before, who had miſtaken ſo much in this very Point; and withall in the Epiſtle of a ſmall Book that I ſince printed, to commend it to others: Mr *Eyre* of *Saliſbury* was offended it ſeems at this, and in an Anſwer to Mr *Woodbridge*, newly publiſhed, with an Epiſtle of Mr *Owens* prefixed, he was pleaſed to ſpeak of me, what thou haſt here Anſwered.

In his Epiſtle againſt me, he telleth us of one Mr *Crandon* of *Hampſhire* that [hath now in the Preſs a large and full Anſwer to my Paradoxicall Aphoriſmes.] The Character that Mr *Eyre* gives of this man is, That he is [a faithfull ſervant of the Lord Jeſus, a workman that needs not to be aſhamed,] This is good news if it be true: for then he will not write ſo many things that deſerve ſhame, as are in this book of Mr *Eyre*'s. But by his wiſh that others [of more ſtrength and far greater helps] may by him be provoked to ſhame, I am afraid what the fruit of his Weakneſs may prove. I confeſs I have heard neer this twelvemoneth, that this man hath been about this work. The laſt I heard, informed me, that [he is againſt the Morality of the Sabbath in Doctrine and Practice notoriouſly, and one that cals it Legal Preaching to Convince men of ſinne and miſery, and ſuppoſed to be of Mr *Eyre*'s Judgement for the Juſtification of Unbelievers; and that he having communicated it to Mr *Eyre*, was

gone with him to *London*, to print a large Answer not only to my Aphorismes, but Passages in my other Books; His book about a hundred sheets, and some six Shillings price, having more leaves then Arguments, but most liberally pouring forth the Titles of Papist, Jesuite, *&c.* which is both the Logick and the Rhetorick of it. Also that he had written to the Eminentest Ministers in several Counties, whom he took to be most disaffected to my Aphorismes, to desire them for themselves and friends to take off his Books, which way is much by some distasted. I can say nothing of him of my own knowledge, nor of his Book till I see it. But if these two men be Brethren in a party, and Mr *Eyre* so much the more esteemed, as I hear; the Reader then may see what to expect by this. I have purposely hasted the Reply to this, that Mr *Crandon* may before his Book come forth, consider better of some things wherein he shall finde his Brother overshot himself, and correct what may tend to his hurt: for I would prevent his sinne. And I do hereby inform thee, Reader, that as soon as ever Mr *Crandon*'s Book doth come to my hands, seeing the scope of it is to revile me as a Papist, I purpose to Print a plain Confession of my Faith, and specially how much I ascribe to Works, and how farre I am from Arminianisme also, which these Brethren do accuse me of, and I shall do it in as little room as I can; and then shall leave it to thy choice, whether thou wilt bestow six Pence to understand my true Belief and Profession, or six Shillings and six weeks reading (at least) to have thy ears charmed with the delicions notes of Papist, Jesuit, Arminian, Socinian, and what not of that kinde? If I finde the Book worth the answering, I know not but I may attempt it at large if ever I have time (which is not like,) But if it be according to my information of it, I shall not trouble my self or thee. It is my lot to be troubled by two sorts of men, commonly called Anabaptists and Antinomians, because I was called by God to Vindicate his Truth against them. There came but lately to my hands two of one sort, and the report of a third that are written against me, Mr *Fisher*, Mr *Haggar*, and Mr *Keye*; but when I found them fraught with non-sense and reviling, I laid them by, and never mean to meddle with them more. Mr *Eyre* and Mr *Crandon* take the next turn: what one hath done I have seen: what the other will do, I know not but by report. But for my own part, I confess I had a hundred times rather encounter with this party then the former: Because I do not apprehend neer so much danger in the opinion of Rebaptizing, or not Baptizing Infants, as in the other. I confess this

also

alſo hath been ſtrangely followed with ſpiritual Judgements: But I ſuppoſe the main cauſe is, becauſe it openeth the door to Separations, Contendings, and ſo Contempt of the Miniſtry that are againſt it: but it is hard to ſee in the nature of the meer Opinions, ſuch hainous evils as we have ſeen attend it. But for the other, in my Judgement they do as dangerouſly ſubvert the very tenour of the Goſpel as well as the Law (and much more) as any Sect that I have known, that hath ſuch men to countenance it. I confeſs alſo that I do apprehend ſome more duty lie on us now to reſiſt that way, then hath been ever heretofore: For it was formerly a very rare thing to meet with a man of Learning or conſiderable Judgement of that way: What men had Dr *Taylor* to deal with? Dr *Criſp*, *Eaton*, *Town*, were the chiefeſt Champions ſince, whom Mr *Burgeſs*, Mr *Geree*, Mr *Bedford* have Confuted. At laſt *Den*, *Paul Hobſon*, Mr *Saltmarſh* took the Chair: The later ſtrangely cryed up by many ignorant ſouls, and his weakneſs laid open by that Excellent, Learned, Reverend Mr *Gataker*. But now Libertiniſm grows into better Reputation. It makes a greater noiſe in City and Country; yea and men of ſome name for Learning, are the Patrons of no ſmall portion of it. Lately came forth a Latine Diſſertation of *Ludiomæus Colvinus*, aliàs, *Ludovicus Molinæus Med. Doctor* and Hiſtory Profeſſour in *Oxford*, writted againſt his own Brother *Cyrus Molinæus* a Miniſter. I anſwered it, before I knew the Authour; and had no ſooner finiſhed it, but I received this of Mr *Eyre's*. I profeſs the deſire of my ſoul is ſo great for the Unity of Brethren and the Churches Peace, that I could heartily wiſh both contendings and dividing Titles as much as may be laid aſide: And therefore for thoſe Reverend Brethren that hold but the more tolerable part of Antinomianiſm, I would not have them called by that name. But for the reſt, to be tender of the credit of ſuch pernicious errours, and to indulge them by favourable titles, is plainly to betray the Goſpel, and mens ſouls.

For my part, if I ſhould not preach againſt the opinion of the Libertines, I could not preach againſt prophaneneſſe: When I look back on the Sermons which I preached many years ago, meerly to work mens hearts to Chriſt, never thinking of the Libertine Controverſies, I finde they were the very ſame things that I am fain to preach now againſt theſe Diſputers. I was feign to prove to them their natural miſery, and that before believing they were children of wrath, and all their ſinnes were unpardoned, with the neceſſity of

Faith, Repentance and Confeſſion, for pardon: and the neceſſity of faithfull Endeavours for the attaining of Salvation; together with the neceſſity of Renewing Repentance, and begging pardon through the bloud of Chriſt, when we fall. Lay by all theſe and ſuch like which the Libertines diſpute againſt, and what have we almoſt to preach to thoſe that will not have Chriſt to Reign over them? Truly I finde as farre as I can diſcern, that moſt of the prophane people in every Pariſh where yet I have liv'd, are Antinomians; They are born and bred ſuch; and it is the very natural Religion of men, that have but the advantage to believe traditionally in Chriſt: I mean, their corrupt nature carrieth them without any teaching to make this uſe of Chriſt and the Goſpel. And almoſt all the ſucceſs of my Labours which hath ſo much comforted me, hath been in bringing men from natural Antinomianiſm or Libertiniſm, to true Repentance and ſaving Faith in Chriſt. And therefore ſhould I now ſide with them, I muſt unſay what I have been long ſaying from the plain word of God, to the ungodly that I have preached to. Bleſſed be God that the Church hath ſuch Writings for plain men to reade, as *Hookers, Boltons, Perkins, Dods, Rogers, Whateleys, Hilderſhams, &c.* which are written in a ſounder ſtrain: Yea that we have ſuch Writings as *Sibbes, Preſtons, Baynes*, &c. to ſhew them, that Conſciences may be Pacified without Antinomianiſm.

I am no Prophet; but I confeſs I am ſo confident that the prevalency of this Sect will be but of ſhort continuance, that I do not much fear them. For though nature be ready enough to befriend it, yet two diſadvantages they runne upon, that will infallibly daſh them all in pieces, as ſoon as the ſtorm of Temptation is allayed. Firſt, They contradict the experiences of the ſouls of Believers; and the very nature of the New-man is againſt them: The greateſt part of the Spirits work on the Soul is againſt Libertiniſm, and the reſt againſt Popery and Pelagianiſm; ſuppoſing the prerequiſite foundation laid. And ſurely the workings of the Spirit are unreſiſtible, and ſhall bear down theſe natural conceits before it. The conteſt between the Goſpel and Libertiniſm in the Church, is like the Conteſt between the Spirit and the fleſh within us, and goes much on the ſame terms: and Chriſt will be Conquerour and bring forth Judgement unto Victory, in both. Sound-hearted Chriſtians, that be not only tickled with Sermons, but ſanctified by the Spirit, will not long be drawn from ſuch apparent Truths, and ſweet and needfull Duties, by the bare names of Free-grace: nor will they deny Free-grace,

and the glory of Christs intercession and Kingdom, upon an empty pretence of magnifying his death; when that very magnifying is but a dishonour. A sound-hearted Christian I am perswaded hath something within him that potently strives against Libertinism and Pelagianism. For example, In prayer, Let a Libertine tell him, [Your sins were all pardoned before you were born, and therefore you must not pray for pardon, but for the Feeling of pardon;] He hath a spirit of prayer within, and a secret impulse to bewail his sinnes, and make out to God for Remission, that will not let him obey those delusions. So if a Pelagian should say [The Power is in thy own Will to please God, and Love and fear him.] The new nature of a Christian doth contradict this, and is inclining him still to beg grace of God, which is a real confession of his own insufficiency. Yea though this Christian should be tainted with either of these Delusions, I am perswaded even while speculatively he holdeth them and talks for them, yet other principles lie deeper in his heart, and are secretly working him a contrary way, even to pray for pardon, contrary to the Libertine, and for prevailing Grace, contrary to the Pelagian.

Another Rock the Libertines run against that will shortly dash them all to pieces: and that is [the clear light of expres Scripture.] So plainly hath God been pleased to reveal his minde in these cases, that though a few may shut their eyes by prejudice, most will see: and if they are blindfolded a while, it is not like to be long. If all Disputers fail us, as long as plain honest Christians have but recourse to the Word of God, it will convince them at last, and shew them the Errour. For example, in this very Discourse (by one of the rationalest men of that way that I have met with) what plain light doth shine in his face! what palpable abuse is he forced to offer to the Scriptures? So that I dare trust a Reader of any competent judgement and honesty, that is not deeply foresталled, to confute him by the bare reading and observation of the Text. As for instance, That to be justified by faith, is to be justified by Christ, without faith. So *pag.*42. he expounds *Gal.*2.16. [*That we might be justified by the faith of Christ*] *i. e.* That it might be manifest that we were justified before we had faith in Christ. But that's common: *pag.*43. That text *Rom.*8.30. which most exactly and purposely expresseth the order of Gods Works, [*Whom he called them he justified*] is put off but thus, 1. The order of words in Scripture do not shew the order and dependance of things, *&c.* 2. The Apostle's scope here

here is not to ſhew in what order theſe benefits are beſtowed, &c.
3. I ſee no inconvenience at all, in ſaying that the Apoſtle here ſpeaks of Juſtification as declared and terminated in conſcience, which ſome Learned men (Mr *Owen* and Mr *Kendall*) do make the *formale* of Juſtification. But more groſſely, *pag.* 44. he expounds *Rom.* 4.24. [*Righteouſneſs ſhall be imputed to us if we beleeve.*] 1. He ſaith, "[The particle [*if*] is not conditional, but declarative, deſcribing "him to whom the benefit belongs.] Yet one would think that it might hence be gathered at leaſt, that This benefit belongs not to Infidels: But to avoid that too, this is his Paraphraſe, "[*q.d.* Here-"by we may know and be aſſured that Chriſts righteouſneſs is im-"puted to us, *&c.*] The Apoſtle ſaith [*It ſhall be imputed, if we beleeve.*] Mr *Eyre* ſaith [We know by this that it was imputed before.] To put the time paſt for the time preſent, and a Declarative for a Conditional, is the way of ſuch bold Interpreters, as make their own faith. But tender-conſcienc't Chriſtians will not long ſuffer you ſo to make their faith, though you may your own.

Beſides ſuch Expoſitions, the Book contains Concluſions ſo contrary 1. To plain reaſon: 2. To known Truths in Divinity: 3. To the new nature or inclination of Beleevers: 4. To his own profeſſions; that though itching ears may be pleaſed by it, and for the bait of [the name of Free Grace] it may be ſwallowed down, yet when Judgement, Affection and Practice ſhould digeſt it, the humble ſoul will vomit it up again. I will give you but a brief touch of his dealing in the four reſpects mentioned.

1. Againſt common reaſon and uſe, he affirms that [If it have any condition, it is not free] and takes Mr *Walkers* patronage, *p.* 93. and applauds and repeats Mr *Kendals* groſs Diſcourſe, which would give much more of the honour and thanks to the Beleever, then the Giver, and repeats his *Welſh* example, [*God bleſs her father and mother, who taught her to reade.*] Yea this groſs conceit is the very ſoul of his Diſcourſe; by which it may appear how bruitiſhly it is animated. But I have proved to him, that a thing may be free that is conditional. *Donatio, Abſoluta, Pura*, and *Gratuita* be not all one, or equipollent terms.

2. And contrary to all ſound Divinity, *pag.* 134. he affirms that [Chriſts death was *ſolutio ejuſdem*, becauſe Chriſt was held in the ſame obligation that we were under: *Gal.* 4.3,4. *He was made under the Law*; not another, but the very ſame.] Either he means here [the ſame obligation to duty] or [the ſame obligation to puniſh-

ment.]

ment.] If the former, what a proof is here that Chriſts ſuffering is *ſolutio ejuſdem*? When the Law obligeth a man to duty, can you thence prove that it obligeth him to puniſhment? then *Adam* before his fall, and Chriſt as an innocent creature, and the Angels in heaven are obliged to puniſhment. But its like he means the later: And then 1. It is moſt unſound and dangerous doctrine, to ſay no more: Chriſts obligation was *ſponſionis propriæ*, the obligation of Contract or Conſent, and as a creature of the ſpecial command of his Father thereto: Our obligation is *violatæ Legis*. Obligation to puniſhment is guilt; our guilt was *Reatus culpæ & pœnæ propter culpam, ex obligatione legis*: Chriſts guilt is but *Reatus pœnæ propter culpam noſtram, ex voluntaria ſuſceptione*. Chriſt was *obligatus ad eandem pœnam* (the ſame in value) but not, *eadam obligatione*. 2. And how doth *Gal.* 4.3,4. prove it? Who can think that it means, Chriſt was made under the curſe of the Law? He was indeed made a curſe for us by undergoing the penalty; but not ſaid to be made under the curſe, nor under the Law as curſing, but as obliging to duty: though its granted that it was part of his humiliation to undertake that task of ceremonious duty.

So *pag.* 191. he ſaith, "[Let them conſider whether it be more ea-"ſie for a man that is dead in ſin, to believe in Chriſt, to love "God, *&c.* then it was for *Adam* in his innocency, *&c.* to abſtain "from the fruit of one tree, when he had a thouſand beſides as good "as that: there can be no condition imagined more facile and fea-"ſable then *Adams* was.] This is againſt them that ſay, Evangelical conditions are eaſier then Legal works. Where he ſeems plainly to think, that it was not perfect obedience internal or external that was the condition of Life to *Adam*, but only the not eating of that tree, and ſo he makes it the eaſieſt thing imaginable. Do you not ſee how admirably he exalteth the Goſpel above the Law, and Chriſts eaſie yoak and burden, and his commands that are not grievous, above that which *Adam* was under? Is it not admirable to ſee that theſe men muſt needs have the new Covenant to have no condition, leſt it be not free, and thoſe muſt be cried down as enemies to free Grace, and Legal Preachers, that teach the neceſſity of faith and repentance to remiſſion of ſinnes, when yet the more rigorous Law of nature, *Do this and Live*, the condition of *Adam*, is the moſt eaſie imaginable? And what thoughts hath he of *Adams* ſin, if he ſee not the Apoſtacy from God to the creature, unbelief, and many hainous ſins were in it, as well as eating of that Tree?

3. Againſt all ſound Divinity, and the very ſenſe of a gracious ſoul, he hath many doctrines which the godly will be ready to tremble at. As *pag.* 122. "[That the Elect *Corinthians* had no more "Right to ſalvation after their Believing then they had before.] You ſee in this mans Judgement what we preach for, and what is the ſtate of a natural man, yea of the verieſt Rebel, Whoremonger, Murderer, that is Elect: he may have more knowledge of his happineſs after, but he hath no more right to ſalvation then before. Why ſay our Divines then that ſuch are not in a ſtate of ſalvation?

So *pag.* 103. he ſaith, "[Though men will not impute or charge "ſin upon themſelves when there is not a Law to convince them of "it, yet it follows not but God did impute ſin to men before there "was any Law promulged, or before the ſin was actually committed. "For what is Gods hating of a perſon but his imputing of ſin, or his "will to puniſh him for his ſin?] Thus Gods preterition or non-election, called hatred, is confounded with his hatred of Juſtice and actual diſpleaſure: and God is made to impute ſin to the innocent who have no ſin, yea to them that are not: When as Imputation of ſin is but either the eſtimation and judging of a ſinner to be a ſinner, or the adjudication of puniſhment for that ſin, or the execution of that puniſhment: all which follow the act of ſin; and ſo he makes Gods act of Imputation to be both *untrue* and unjuſt; but that indeed he gives the name of Imputation to the eternal Decree, to which God never gave it.

So *pag.* 61. he ſaith, concerning all that Chriſt died for, though yet Infidels and Wicked, that "[Divine Juſtice cannot charge up-"on them any of their ſins, nor inflict upon them *the leaſt* of thoſe "puniſhments which their ſins deſerve; but contrarily he beholds "them as perſons perfectly righteous, and accordingly deals with "them as ſuch who have no ſin at all in his ſight.] What humble ſoul would not tremble to ſay this of himſelf now regenerate; much more of the unregenerate? Muſt God be unjuſt if he inflict on us the *leaſt puniſhment* for ſin? And yet Scripture ſays ſo oft that God puniſheth his people, in expreſs words? If it be *pœna propter culpam* it is puniſhment. and is none of your pain, loſſes, croſſes, ſuch? Is not the ſmalneſs of your knowledge, love, *&c.* and the remnant of ſin, as ſuffered upon you, a puniſhment? nor death, nor the bodies remaining in the grave? Are not chaſtiſements a *ſpecies* of puniſhment? Is not a man puniſhed when he is hang'd for a ſin? yea and that by God as well as man? What man dare ſay, [Lord, if thou

hadſt

hadſt laid the leaſt puniſhment on my body, before Converſion, even in the height of my ſin, thou hadſt been unjuſt? yea or if yet thou do it.] Was there no puniſhment in the dominion of ſin, and the want of the ſenſe of Gods favour, which they make to be the contrary to Remiſſion and Juſtification? The Lord deliver poor ſouls from ſuch Doctrines as theſe! Yea ſo far as they have grace, ſo far they are delivered. And I hope Mr *Eyre* ſpeaks againſt his own heart, by the conduct of his fancy, and the inſtigation of his contentious paſſion,

4. Is it not againſt his own pretence, that he ſaith, in his Epiſtle to the Parliament, "[Though God doth effectually move and per-"ſwade mens hearts, yet he doth not Neceſſitate them to believe and "embrace the truth.] Would you think and reade this that the man were ſo zealous againſt the Arminians, when I, who am called Papiſt and Arminian, do think, that God doth ſo effectually move men to believe, as thereby to neceſſitate them? Though ſtill he doth cauſe us to do it *liberè*, though *neceſſariò*, and ſo neceſſitate us, as that the act is ſtil contingent in it ſelf, as from our will.

So *pag.*117. he hath theſe words, "[I dare ſay, a more unſound "Aſſertion cannot be picked out of the Papiſts or Arminians, then "this is, that faith (taking it as he doth in a proper ſenſe) hath the "ſame place in the Covenant of Grace, as works have in the Cove-"nant of Works.] Where mark, that Mr *Woodbridge* ſpeaks only of the *place* of faith, and not of the worth, nature, dignity, nor full uſe, as if it properly or fully had the ſame office as Works, but the ſame order in the Covenant. And then ſee 1. Whether this man doth not make Papiſts of the generality of the Proteſtant Churches, and Writers? 2. Or make the Papiſts as ſound as the Proteſtants. 3. Of what credit this mans word is, that uſhers it in with ſuch confidence, [I dare ſay it,] and whether the reaſon why he *dares ſay* that and ſo many more ſuch things, may not be becauſe he thinks all's pardoned already, even before he beleeved. 4. He pretendeth Mr *Pemble* to be of his Judgement; yet ſee whether he make not Mr *Pemble* to hold as unſound doctrine, as any can be picked out of the Writings of Papiſts or Arminians: I may well bear his heavy charge, when Mr *Pemble* muſt bear it, who ſaies, Treat. of *Juſtif.* pag.23. [*There are two Covenants that God hath made with man, By one of which, and by no other means in the world, ſalvation is to be obtained. The one is the Covenant of Works, the tenour whereof is* [Do this and thou ſhalt live, *&c.*] *The other is the Covenant of Grace, the tenour*

whereof is [Beleeve in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, *&c.*] *The condition of this Covenant is Faith.*] And so goes on to shew that the performance and nature of Faith and Works differ; but here gives them the same place of a condition in the Covenant. And *pag.* 22. he saith, [*The condition required in such as shall be partakers of this grace of Justification is true faith, whereunto God hath ordinarily annexed this great priviledge, That by faith and faith only a sinner shall be justified.*]

So *pag.*206. he ensnares himself in an objection, which he cannot answer, as I doubt not but Mr *Woodbridge* will fully shew him, when he hath sifted what is the adequate object of that *Assensus intellectus* and *amplexus voluntatis* which Mr *Eyre* acknowledgeth. But I must ask pardon of Mr *Woodbridge* for thus anticipating his work. Reader, do but study God and thy own heart, and keep a tender conscience, and an upright life, and a little knowledge more may preserve thee from being a Libertine.

One thing I forgot, which I now adde, To intreat Mr *Eyre* and his partakers, to tell me, upon their grounds, Whether God do accept of the Works as well as the Person of an Elect Infidel? If they say, No: How then are they in Christ, and God perfectly pleased with them? and all the sinfulnesse of those works forgiven? Doth not God accept of that work in which there is no sin imputed? but all pardoned? nothing but the sinfulness can hinder his Acceptance of it? And where then is their vain distinction (that God is pleased with the person and not the work) by which they answer us when we tell them truly, that *Without faith it is impossible to please God? Heb.*11.6.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

§. 1.

THE Defence of my Praiſes of Mr Woodbridges Sermon.

Of my ſleighting all Proteſtant Divines that differ from me, particularly Mr Twiſs.

Of my Daring as a Dictator to preſcribe what men ſhall reade.

Whether it be true, that with me an Antinomian and an Antipapiſt are all one?

About the name Antinomian.

Whether only ſins againſt the light of nature muſt be puniſhed by Magiſtrates?

Whether it be no contradiction to have no ſin puniſhed but what's againſt the light of nature: and yet to have a penalty on them that will call men Antinomians? and not on Mr E. for calling Papiſt?

Whether all the Reformed Churches hold that which I call Antinomianiſm?

Severall ſlanders of Mr E. refuted, About Merit and aſcribing to Works.

Of my ſaying Chriſts ſatisfaction is Cauſa ſine quâ non of Juſtification.

Gardiners Poſitions anſwered, which Mr E. makes like mine.

§. 2.

Of my Cenſure of Maccovius and others. Mr Eyre's teſtimonies examined: Pemble, Rutherford, &c.

§. 3.

Whether I make all Antinomians that deny Juſtification by perſonal Righteouſneſs? and whether I be ſingular therein?

§. 4.

How I deny or hold Chriſt to be our Material Righteouſneſs? and imputation to be the form of Juſtification.

Of making Chriſt a Cauſa ſine quâ non. More about Merit. Mr Es befriending the Papiſts.

§. 5.

§. 5.

More about our personal Righteousnes. My Judgement about Justification by our personal Righteousnes opened in 12. *Conclusions.*

Mr E*s Arguments against personal Righteousnes in Justification answered:* Paul *excludes not all Works: nor all that Debt which is by free Gift of promise. What Justification by Works* Paul *speaks against.*

Whether Protestants acknowledging an Evangelical inherent Righteousnes, do not eo nomine *acknowledge that we are Justified by it as far as I do?*

Mr E. *gives up his Cause, confessing that it is Christ and not We that are the subjects of Justification before we are born: No addition to Christs Righteousnes to be Justified by faith or personal Righteousnes in subordination to it. Imperfect faith may be the Condition of the pardon of its own Imperfections. How faith is taken for the object, in the matter of Justification.*

§. 6.

Whether I include Works in Faith?

§. 7.

All Conditions are not Moral Causes, no nor any quà *Conditions.*

Mr E. *denying Christs death to be the Cause of Gods Justifying, makes it as much a* sine qua non *as ever I did, and much more. He is desired to expedite, How Christs death can be the Meritorious Cause* rei voli tæ, *without Causing the* actum volentis? *All the effects of* Electing Love *are not given, by, through and for Christ,* viz. as the Meritorious Cause.

§. 8.

Mr E*s uncharitable Censure of Mr* J. Woodbridge. *How our Divines deny Dispositions and preparations to Justification.*

§. 9.

His urging the invincibleness of Mr Owens *Answer, about Reconciliation being an Immediate effect of Christs death.*

§. 10.

His citation of Mr Strong. *Proved against him (which may serve to the like of Mr* Owen) *that it is not of necessity that a Condition be* quoad eventum *unknown to the promiser; and that God hath Conditional Promises and Threats though the Condition be foreknown as to the event.*

§. 11.

Mr Eyre*s proved a notorious slanderer, in saying, that the Papists ascribe no more meritoriousnes to Works then I do,] by the testimony of* Bellarmine, Aquinas, *and Mr* Perkins, *as a tast til I come to Mr* Crand.

Many gross passages of his Book are also opened in the Preface.

§. 12.

§. 1.

Reverend Brother,

I Lately received a Book of your writing (whereof I had before intelligence by the weekly News book) entitled [*Juſtification without Conditions, or The Free Juſtification of a ſinner*] againſt Mr *Woodbridge*, Mr *Crauford* and my Self, as Aſſertors of *Conditional Juſtification*. Your ſcope is to prove the Juſtification of Infidels, or of the Elect before Faith, and before they are men, if I underſtand you. Methinks, there appears in your lines, much more Piety, Candor and Judgement, then I am wont to meet with in men of your Way; though with mixed diſcoveries of too much defect, eſpecially in the two laſt. For my own part, I bleſs God, I have at laſt learned to love and honour a Chriſtian as a Chriſtian; and therefore all that are Chriſtians; though they have that withall that is diſpleaſing to Chriſt, and muſt be ſo to me. This Debt I confeſs I owe you; Chriſt in you is nevertheleſs Chriſt, becauſe of your frailties; and though he delay much of the cure of your diſtempers, I hope he will in due time accompliſh it; and when the remnants of your darkneſs are removed, you will ſee that truth which now you ſee not. I ought not to deſpiſe you for theſe infirmities, when I am daily groaning under them my ſelf; and am in the hands of the ſame Phyſition; and am ſo conſcious of a neceſſity of his tender handling. If Chriſt would not take me with all my faults, and diſtinguiſh betwixt his own and mine, between me and my ſins, and put up many a thouſand provocations, I were loſt. And ought I not to honour Chriſt in you, and ſee his amiableneſs through the clouds of ſuch humane frailties, which you as well as your ſinfull Brethren, are yet liable to? Yet as Chriſt loves my ſins never the more (that is, hates them nevertheleſs) for all his incomprehenſible love to me, no more will he allow me to love yours. And as I muſt not think well of them, ſo neither muſt I ſpeak well of them. If I ſhould not miſtake that for your ſinne which is none, I ſuppoſe I ſhall have your free conſent to acquaint you with it: And if I miſtake not thoſe for your Errours which are none, I ſuppoſe you will conſent that I warn all thoſe that reade your Book, to take heed of them and reject them. For I ſuppoſe you are Virtually contrary to thoſe Opinions which you Actually hold and maintain, and thoſe Practiſes which Actually you venture to commit. I take it therefore for my duty, as to manifeſt your Errours with a hatred to them, becauſe they are againſt Chriſt; ſo with Chriſtian charity to your ſelf, becauſe you intended well, and are Virtually for Chriſt, even when you do

moſt

moſt againſt him. For I perceive you have a zeal for Chriſt, though it ſeems to me, not according to knowledge: And though ſome of your opinions, I much fear, are deſtructive of Fundamentals, and would not ſtand with ſalvation, if they were fully reduced to practice, yet I perceive great reaſon of hopes in the reſt of your Writings, and by that good which I have heard of you, that you hold them but ſpeculatively, and that in the main you live contrary to the natural tendency of your opinions. I remember therefore that I am writing to a Brother that I muſt live with in Everlaſting Glory, where we ſhall be both of one minde, when we are perfected in Knowledge: I remember that I am Writing againſt ſuch ſins as are pardoned in the blood of Chriſt; and as will be very ſhortly renounced by your ſelf, and againſt which you will be incomparably more zealous then I can now be, and will ſpeak more diſgracefully of them then now I muſt do. If in the mean time you are confident in the dark, and angry with thoſe that would do you good, yea and abuſe them who walk not according to your conceits, it is no wonder, conſidering what man is, even the beſt of the Saints while they live in the fleſh: Being my ſelf liable to the ſame diſtempers, I crave your pardon, if I ſhall any way injure you in theſe following lines.

The ſubſtance of your Book I perceive is againſt M. *Woodbridge*; M. *Cranford* and I are brought in but on the by, but ſo as that you deal with him but in the beginning, and with me almoſt throughout. I ſhall not anticipate M. *Woodbridge*, and therefore intend not the anſwering of your Book, but to give you a brief account of my thoughts, of ſo much of it as concerns my ſelf.

Your firſt onſet is in your third Epiſtle. My title is [*A leading man in theſe times:*] when I have neither worldly advantages, nor eminency of Abilities, nor yet opportunities to be much Leading to any but my own Charge. I live I believe as retiredly as you, cloiſtered up in obſcurity, daily exerciſed with the chaſtiſements of my Lord, and waiting for my change, and minding little to be the Leader of any, further then to help them to heaven to the utmoſt of my power. And for leading of men into any Parties, from the Unity of Chriſtians, my ſoul is poſſeſſed with as deep a deteſtation of it, as of moſt ſins that the world is guilty of. And I think no man did ever yet come to you, and ſay, that I once laboured with him to bring him to any private opinion of my own: My Wtitings contain all my fault of that kinde, that I know of. And for them, I deſire you and all men to underſtand me, not as peremptorily affirming every thing that I ſpeak in difficult Controverſies, to be infallible Verities, but only as giving you my own opinion of it, and leaving you and all Readers to accept or reject it, according to the evidence. If what I ſpeak, have evidence of Truth, you cannot darken it by what you ſay againſt my perſon: If it have none, my perſon hath no advantage, to make my opinion taking with the world.

The matter which you firſt charge me with is, my commendation of M. *Woodbridge*'s Book in the Epiſtle to my *Directions for Comfort*. And your ſelf are pleaſed to give M. *Woodbridge* your free commendations for the eminency of his natural and acquired parts, even to be as *Saul* above his Brethren: and that you ſeem to confine his worth to theſe, as if in ſpirituals the matter were otherwiſe, will make his cauſe never the worſe before his Judge. You adde that "[It is not to be wondred at that M. *B.* hath given this ſuperlative *encomium* to M. *Woodbridge*'s Sermon; he knew well enough that it would rebound upon himſelf, M. *W.* being a ſon of his own faith, and this notion of his, but a ſpark from out of M. *Baxter*'s forge.] *Repl.* 1. Thus do bad cauſes hang together, and the ſentences of the

Oblivious

Oblivious destroy each other. My great imperfections are commonly known; Mr. *W.* you confess to be as *Saul* above his Brethren: What likelihood then of his receiving these things from me? 2. If you speak of the cause in hand, do you seriously think that I am the first that hath said, that [*Infidels are not justified*] or that [*The Elect are not justified till they have faith.*] Think you that Mr. *W.* need to come to such a one as I, to learn that which the Church hath held ever since it was called Christian? 3. Truly I never saw Mr. *Woodbridge*, nor did there ever a message or word in writing pass between us; nay (living here obscurely out of the observation of things remote) I had never to my knowledge heard of him, till I saw his Book. But when I did see, *expede Herculem*, I saw such discoveries in it of a clear understanding, which caused me to bless God for such a man, and in special that you had drawn him out into the world; nor am I sorry much for this your Answer to him, as not doubting but it will draw forth yet more of Gods precious gifts, which he is furnished with for his Church: I also much rejoyced in that providence of God which had made him successor at *Newbury* to Dr. *Twisse*, giving that people a man so sound, and so able to inform them better, in that one point, wherein the Doctor did so mistake. And indeed Sir, I should take it for a great priviledge, were I near him, to be the Auditor and Scholar of so Judicious a man; and I doubt not you will finde, that he is well able to manifest your mistakes to the world. And I confess I honour him yet more then I did, since you tell me in this Book (which I knew not before) that Mr. *Parker* was his Grandfather; the name of that man for his Labours and Patience (and especially that excellent Treatise *de Descensu*) being very precious to me. 4. And for your intimation of my self-seeking in commending his Book; you know it is our Masters prerogative to be the Searcher of hearts. Do not you know that an honest man may value those most that are of his own minde? Nay *must* do, *cæteris paribus*; for else he cannot value a man for the sake of Gods Truth: For did we not *take* it to be truth, we could not be of that minde our selves. Doth not this raise your estimation of the Learned commender of your Book, and of others whom you oft quote? Would you have envied the praises of Mr. *W.* or his Labours, if he had been of your opinion? Do as you would be done by: Would you have been offended if I had as much commended you and yours?

You adde, "[I suppose Mr. *Baxter*'s praises or dispraises are not greatly regarded by sober-minded Christians, who have observed how highly he magnifies "*J. Goodwin* with others of his notion, and how slightingly he mentions Dr. *Twisse* "and all our Protestant Divines that differ from him.]

Repl. I confess in respect of ability of judging of mens Learning, and the worth of superlative Divines above my reach, my praise is small addition to any mans honour: But whether my conscience be so small that sober-minded Christians neither *should* nor *do* regard my words, must be determined by my Judge, to whose blessed and more equitable sentence I am approaching. And so farre as I am guilty of Error or partiality, I beg his pardon (for its according to my Judgement so to do.) For the high magnifying of *Jo. Goodwin* which you mention, I desire the time and the words may be considered; and then I think he that would then envy him such a commendation, is more partial then I am, though I were as contrary to him as you. I thought it had been only unmannerly language to my Brethren that I had been blamed for: but it seems its praising them too, if it be against the interest of the adverse party. Have you ever heard me praise him for any evil? If you have, speak it out: If not, give me leave to love a Christian as

Christian, and a mans Parts and Labours so farre as they deserve, and to honour so much of Christ as I see in any. But how plainly do you still confute your self? You intimate that my commending men is because I am of the same minde: and yet you know or should do, that I do in that very place profess my own Judgement to be contrary to that of Mr. *Goodwin* and the rest there named, and that I only reprehend men for their bitterness and contempt of them. Now Sir, if your conscience will warrant you in such dealing as this, to say I commend men as *of my notion*, (if you mean mine) even when I purposely express my opinion to be against them, and write against theirs, it is not of the same complexion as mine is, as bad as I am.

And as little truth is there in your words of my slighting Dr. *Twiss*, yea and all our Protestant Divines! Which be the words Sir that are guilty of that charge? For Dr. *Twiss* I have honoured few men living more formerly; and much honour his Name and Labours still; though I rejoyce that I am got out of the snare of one or two of his Mistakes. You are no Papist I hope; and therefore do not think a man slighted that is not taken to be infallible, or perfect. But of this I have said enough to Mr. *Kendall*. The rest of your Accusation, (as to all Protestant Divines that differ from me) is either a breach of the ninth Commandment, or else my Tongue or Pen hath somewhere spoken quite contrary to my heart.

I marvell at your next speeches, that "[Mr. *W.* throughout all his Sermon, "never so much as hinted, how or in what sense we are justified by faith.] Whereas he doth it as solidly (in my weak judgement) as ever I read in any Divine? Nay when your self bestow some labour to confute him: Doth he not tell you it justifies us by the way of a condition, though Naturally Active, yet Morally as it were Passive, qualifying us for Gods free Justification by his Covenant? To this purpose, but more largely, I well remember he speaks. How then durst you say, and publish to the world, that he never hinted how or in what sense we are justified by faith? Sure Brother, this is not well done.

Next you say of me, that "[His advice to all Christians to buy one of these "Sermons, argues rather his conceit of himself, then his charity to them.] *Repl.* Both these sins, self-conceitedness and want of charity, are latent in the heart, and by the Searcher of hearts it is that I must be tried, whose high prerogative, my opinion is, you should not usurp. Truly Brother, I have as much reason to value Truth, so far as I know it, as you or other men: and as little reason as many to be byassed in my seeking it. I dare say, I dearly love it, and that the searching for it doth cost me somewhat? If I know it not, it is not because I would not know it if I could. It is my hourly studied, and daily prayers, and if I knew any other lawfull possible way to attain it, how gladly would I use it, though it were to the loss of all I have in the world, or though the Truth were contrary to my former opinions, or though it would subject me to the hatred of my dearest friends! He that knows my heart, knows that I speak my heart, if I know it my self. Nor do I take this for any high commendations; for mans intellect (as *participative* voluntary) doth Will Truth as its proper natural object. I mean, it would know things as they are (where carnal interest and enmity causeth not the perverting of the soul herein.) And I do not finde in my *flesh* the least opposition to your opinion.

Where you adde your reason "[That he dares take upon him the Office of a "Universal Dictator to prescribe not only to his *Kederminsterians*, but to all private "Christians

"Christians what Books they shall reade.] *Repl.* If by [*prescribing*] you mean [commanding] all men know that I am no Commander, and therefore my commands were more likely to be derided then obeyed. If you mean [advising] Why may I not dare to do that? Is that the work of a Dictator? If I may advise in other points of duty, I know not why I may not do the like in this. I have advised to the reading of other Books (as flat, I think, against your opinion) *Bolton, Perkins, Hooker, Preston*, &c. yet none ever charged me with [daring to prescribe as a Dictator.] However you know my word will not take much, and therefore you need not be so much offended. And for all the distinctions which you are pleased to take as Herring-bones, I doubt not but to mean Christians, that Book may be profitable: and that may prove happy food to others, which you call *Poison*.

You adde [As for the title of Antinomianism which he bestows upon our "doctrine, it is no great slander out of Mr. *Baxter*'s mouth, with whom an An-"tinomian and an Antipapist are *termini convertibiles*.]

Repl. 1. To begin with your last because it is the reason of the former: It is written, *Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart, but shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour and not suffer sin upon him*, Lev. 19. 17. I perceive by your words that you are Pastor of a Gathered Church (as it's call'd) were I one of your neer communion, I should openly desire satisfaction concerning these words, not as to my self for the wrong, but as to the Church, that otherwise if you prove impenitent, we might avoid you. My reasons are, because God hath said, *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour*. And *Lev.* 19 11. *Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsly, neither lye one to another*. Deut. 19. 18, 19. *Behold, if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsly against his brother; then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his brother*. And I suppose you would avoid communion with a Papist, and have men so to do. *Prov.* 6. 16, 19. *Six things doth the Lord hate, yea seven are abomination to him: A proud look, a lying tongue,---a false witness that speaketh lies, and him that soweth discord among brethren*. Prov. 19. 5. *A false witness shall not be unpunished, and he that speaketh lies shall not escape*. So *ver.* 9. *Prov.* 14. 5. & 12. 17. *Rev.* 22. 15. *Without are---- and whosoever loveth and maketh a lye*, Psal. 15. 1, 2, 3. *Lord who shall abide in thy Tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy Hill? He that walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart*. Now as to the fact I prove it thus: If with me an Antipapist and an Antinomian be *termini convertibiles*, or all one, then I take all Antipapists for Antinomians. But the later is false: Therefore so is the former. All the Churches of *France, Belgia, Bohemia, Helvetia, Scotland, England*, &c. who subscribed the Harmony of Confessions, or owned them: All our Reverend Assemblies that made the late Confession of Faith and Catechisms, and all that own them: All that subscribed the Synod of *Dort*, I take for Antipapists, and yet I take them not for Antinomians, no nor any man for an Antinomian who believeth any one of all these: Therefore I take not all Antipapists for Aminomians. Again, either you speak of my heart or of my language. For the later, shew where, or prove when I said that Antipapists and Antinomians are *termini convertibiles*, expressly or implicitly, and then call me a slanderer and spare not. If you speak of my Thoughts, I know them better then you, and I profess them to be otherwise. Nay in the very particulars wherein I differ or seem to differ from my Brethren, I have received large Animadversions from very many Learned men, and I profess to take not one of them all for an Antinomian. So much for your ground-work. Now to your structure.

As for the term [Antinomian] I confeſs I think it more fitly applied to the Practice of thoſe whom I have known of that way, then to their Doctrine: For whereas the name is taken from one of the leaſt of their great Errors, it ſhould have rather been taken from the greater. For my part I heartily wiſh that among thoſe whoſe opinions unfit them not for the Communion of Saints, and ſuffice not to Excommunicate them, all names of Parties or of Reproach were utterly laid aſide; and would willingly contribute my beſt endeavours to that end, and heartily joyn with you in your motion to the Parliament that a Penalty might reſtrain ſuch Dividing wayes. But yet 1. while men go commonly under ſuch a name, we can ſcarce tell how to make known whom we ſpeak of, but by the name or a deſcription equipollent. 2. And I take a full Antinomian to be one that is unfit for Chriſtian communion, as ſubverting the very ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religion. But I confeſs I think it fitter to call them Antigoſpellers, or Antichriſtian, or Libertines, then Antinomians: And becauſe it is the old and fit name, hereafter I will uſe rather the name of *Libertines*. But for ſober moderate men, which are but half Antinomians, holding but the leſs dangerous part of their opinions, and diſclaiming the reſt, (though they are ſhrewdly concatenated) and not ſeeing that the reſt do follow them, truly, as I dare not diſaffect them, nor would avoid communion with them, ſo neither would I have them called Antinomians, further then to themſelves to convince them of their participation in that ſinfull way, as the name may be uſed in a courſe of arguing. And of theſe I hope you are one: and I hope it is no worſe with ſome of your partakers.

But Sir, methinks you have ſome very ſtrange paſſages in your Epiſtle Dedicatory about theſe things: I would warn you to ſearch your heart whether the later part of the ſecond page of that Epiſtle, be not the venting of pure malice; and a trampling upon men that have more to ſay againſt you, then you ſeem to take notice of. But the thing I mean is 1. Your moſt dangerous doctrine. 2. Your moſt palpable ſelf-contradiction by word and deed. 1. In the bottom of the third page in your parentheſis "[Nor can I excuſe their connivence at any of thoſe "evils that are contrary to the Law of nature.] You ſeem to teach that the Magiſtrate ſhould puniſh no other evils; for theſe words, following a diſcourſe againſt force in matter of Religion, can bear no other ſenſe that I know of. But is this your friendſhip to Chriſt, that you would have the Magiſtrate be indifferent to him and Mahomet or Antichriſt? What? not command the preaching of Chriſt? and puniſh the neglect of it in thoſe that ſhould do it? Nor hinder men from preaching againſt Chriſt, or calling him a Deceiver, or blaſpheming the holy Ghoſt? nor for preaching up Mahomet? Is this your friendſhip to the Parliament as to draw them into ſuch a guilt, which would cauſe God to curſe them and caſt them out, and make their names hatefull to the Chriſtian world? Is this your love to the Churches of Chriſt, that you would have this deluge of guilt and confuſion let in upon us? Methinks the very thoughts of ſuch a dolefull ſtate of the Church, ſhould make your heart ſad! Is this your love to your native Land, to open upon it ſuch a Floodgate of deſolation? And is this your love to the ſouls of men to proſtitute them to all deluders? If you think that truth is ſo diſcernable to good and bad, that if all may but ſpeak there is no great danger; do but open your eyes and Judge by the experience which theſe times afford you! You can ſcarce get men to receive the truth that hear none contradicting it: How much leſs when they have ten ſpeaking againſt it, for one that ſpeaks for it, and that with ſuch ſubtilty as they cannot reſiſt?

Nay,

Nay, Sir, I had hoped that you who do ſo let fly at me as a Papiſt, would not have proved ſuch a friend to Popery. Would you have Popery have Liberty in *England* again in all the Points of it that are not againſt the Light of Nature? Truly you ſhew me but what I ſaw before! that all over-doing is undoing! and that none would ſooner let in Popery then thoſe that fly to the contrary extream. But ſhall I tell you Sir; If once they have full liberty here as you have, I think you will finde, that their numbers and prevalency will cloud your Sect, and all the reſt of the Sects in *England*. And as very a Papiſt as I am, I would far rather joyn with you to keep them out; and would intreat you for the Peace of your own Conſcience that you would unſay this again, and write a recantation of it to the Parliament.

I would have you alſo to conſider your ſtrange Contradictions to your own words.

1. You would have Names of Obloquy, and in particular that of *Antinomians*, reſtrained by Penalties. But is it againſt the light of nature for a man that is in Judgement againſt you, to call you Antinomian? If the Religion or doctrine may be tolerated, why may not the Naming of men accordingly? You will allow men to Do Evil, but not to be called Evil Doers? Where the Light of Nature reacheth not the Thing, me thinks it ſhould not reach the Name! He that ſhould judge you a Heretick, and thinks it his duty to make it known, ſeeth not by the light of Nature that he may not Call you ſo.

2. May not the Lord Jeſus (for whom you ſeem zealous) have ſome of that favour from you, or reſpect, or tenderneſs of his Name and Honour, which you would have your ſelf? If the Parliament muſt lay a Penalty on them that will call you Antinomian, I pray you put in one word with it, that they may lay a Penalty on any that will Call Chriſt a Deceiver, or reproach his Holy Name, or doctrine, or wayes; or would ſet up Mahomet or Antichriſt againſt him; whether this be againſt the light of Nature or no. At leaſt it is againſt the light of Nature to deſpiſe God: and Chriſt ſaith, *He that deſpiſeth you* (his Miniſters) *deſpiſeth me, and he that deſpiſeth me, deſpiſeth him that ſent me.*

3. If all theſe Names muſt be reſtrayned by Penalties, then I doubt the Name of Papiſt muſt be reſtrayned, and Socinian too: And would you indeed have a Law made to puniſh all that call men Papiſts or Socinians? and yet ſeem ſo zealous againſt them. Still the *Overdoing* Enemies, are the greateſt friends, to Popery and other Errors.

4. But how comes it to paſs that I muſt be ſo frequently with you a Papiſt, Socinian, Arminian, and yet it is a ſin to be reſtrayned by Penalties to uſe Names of obloquy? But you ſhew us plainly what kinde of Liberty of Conſcience it is that men are now for: A Liberty for them and others to abuſe Chriſt, his truth, and their Brethren: but a reſtraint of ſpeaking againſt their reputation. It ſeems though you ſpeak generally, it was the Name of Antinomian or Libertine that you meant. Truly Sir, though M^r *Woodbridge*, M^r *Cranford* and I, deſerve not ſo much reſpect at your hands, yet me thinks the Parliament deſerved ſounder advice, and better and more carefull language of you then this: You ſhould not have beſpoken them with ſuch Contradictions and dangerous Intimations.

You proceed with me thus [" Let him ſhew us any one Church or ſingle per-
" ſon, accounted Orthodox, till this preſent age, that did not hold ſome, yea moſt
" of thoſe Points which he cals Antinomianiſm, and I will openly acknowledge
" I have done him wrong: otherwiſe let him be looked upon as a ſlanderer and

"reviler of all the Protestant Churches, who under a shew of friendship, hath endeavoured to expose them to the scorn and obloquy of their enemies.

Rep. I willingly stand to your motion: But I must needs say, that the tempter hath much foiled you, when he prevailed with you to write these and the following words: and so add impudency to falshood and slander: for so it is. You should have cited my words which you lay this charge upon, or else I know not what to vindicate; for I know not what you mean. But observe, that the question between us is not, Whether any of the reformed Churches do differ from me in any thing, or Whether I erre therein? But, Whether they hold any, yea most of those opinions which I call Antinomianisme? Would you make men believe that all the Protestant Churches are of your opinion? This is to put out mens eyes, and bid them renounce both sense and reason. I will call no man Antinomian that doth hold the doctrines of the most Imperfect Confession in all the Harmony: Nay, I provoke you if you are able to name one man in the first, second, third, fourth or fifth Century, yea or for a thousand if not fourteen hundred years after Christ, that held any two, yea one, of the opinions which I ever call'd Antinomianism, except it were some that were notorious Hereticks. Till then, I suppose it is not the Accused, but the Accuser that is reputed the Calumniator till he make good his charge.

You proceed, ["Mr. *B.* (the better to ingage his Reader), tels him his doctrine is of a middle strain, as if all the reformed Churches had hitherto been in "an extream, in this fundamentall point of our Justification.]

Rep. 1. Though Justification be a fundamentall, yet so is not every point that concerneth it.

2. I hope you will not perswade us that all the Protestant Churches are for the Justification of Infidels! unless it be by taking the name of Protestant Churches from all that will not say as you.

3. What Divine of note can you name, but doth in one thing or other, differ from the greater part? I think but few. Yet we do not for that one Point separate him from the rest. And let me add to the former Section, that if it be proved of any one or more of our Divines, that they hold one or two lesser points of Antinomianisme, I think it not fit therefore to call them Antinomians. I will not call *Zanchy* a Papist, because he denied the Pope to be the Antichrist; or because of his so much differencing *Johns* Baptisme and Christs: nor will I call him an Anabaptist, because he thought that those in *Acts* 19. were twice baptized, alledging so many Fathers of his minde. The like I may say of many another.

4. No wonder if any doctrine that avoideth your extream be contemned by you: It hath alway been so with men in extreams. But the day is coming when Moderation and Truth (which lieth between extreams) will be better regarded.

5. As for my [engaging my Reader] which you talk of; I know not whether it discover more of the secrets of your own heart or mine: sure I am you know not mine, but should know your own: And if you speak according to yours, I will speak according to mine, and thats this; that I love Gods Truth, and therefore would propagate it; and I love mens souls, and therefore would do them all the good that I can; but for any advantage that I aim at to my self by *engaging* men to me, besides the doing of my duty, I yet know it not. Nay I must needs reckon upon the loss of mens esteem before I resolve to cross them in their opinions.

You proceed like the rest ["I am sure he gives as much unto Works and less "unto Christ then the Papists do.]

Rep.

Rep. A falſe witneſs ſhall not be unpuniſhed, and he that ſpeaketh lies ſhall not eſcape, Prov.19.5. Review the texts before cited. Truly, Sir, I cannot think you durſt ſin thus without ſhame and fear, if you had not been hardened in ſecurity, by thinking your ſins were forgiven before you were born! What good will all your Arguments do to prove to any man, that your doctrine encourageth not men in ſin, while they ſhall ſee you run on in it ſo boldly? What hear we *words* for, when we ſee contrary *deeds*? As the Papiſts have done as much againſt their Religion, by Powder plots, Treaſons, lying, as by their very erroneous doctrines, among thoſe that judge by ſuch experiences; ſo have the men of your ſect done, to the wonder of obſervers. Whether your words here be true or not, I ſhall refer the Reader to my Reply to Mr *Crandon*, whither I reſerve it.

You add [" He makes Works by Virtue of Gods Promiſes and Covenant, to be " the meritorious Cauſes of Juſtification and Salvation, and in no other ſenſe do " the Papiſts affirm it.]

Rep. Thou ſhalt not bear falſe witneſs againſt thy neighbour. It is a harſh provoking kind of anſwering, for to give a brother a plain *mentiris*: and therefore I love not to deal with thoſe ſayings, that will admit of no other anſwer in termes or ſenſe. If the ninth Commandment be Law, then this practice of yours is Antinomian. Produce that place; expreſs thoſe words of mine, which may make good this charge. I have ever profeſſed that our beſt works are not in the leaſt degree meritorious, no not of a bit of bread, much leſs of Juſtification and Salvation. There never fell from my Pen ſuch a word as you charge me with, and yet you dare do it. One would think that common wit ſhould have told you, that when the falſhood of ſuch paſſages *de facto* are diſcovered, it ſhould redound to your own ſhame, and conſequently to the great prejudice of your Cauſe. Nay I durſt not acknowledge any Cauſality in faith to our Juſtification, and therefore in that Point adventured to differ from many Brethren: Yet doth this man ſay, that I [*make Works by Virtue of Gods Promiſe and Covenant, meritorious Cauſes of Juſtification.* And mark what an occaſion he takes of this ſlander. In the 26. *Theſ.* of my *Aphor.* I purpoſely ſpeak againſt the doctrine of Merit; ſhewing that properly no works of ours can be called Meritorious, but in the end did concede that Improperly they may: This I did, becauſe the Fathers for many hundred years after Chriſt uſe the word *Merit*, in application to mans works; and becauſe all our Divines that ever I read againſt the Papiſts, *nemine contradicente*, do anſwer that the Fathers uſed the word *Merit* improperly. But theſe three things I ever profeſſed in ſpeech and writing on all occaſions. 1. That no acts or works of ours are Meritorious Cauſes of ſalvation, much leſs of Juſtification. 2. That therefore the word Merit cannot be applied to them, but Improperly. 3. That therefore it is not fit to uſe ſo much as the word. And though when we read it in the Councils or Fathers, we muſt interpret it with a due reverence to them, yet is it fit to be excluded among our ſelves. Yet ſhould I meet with any godly, ſober man of a contrary judgement, that thought the name might be uſed while he interprets it in the ſame ſenſe which the Reformed Churches hold, I would not approve of that mans opinion of the uſe of the word, but yet I would not for the bare word pretend that we are of different Religions, or do differ in the Thing which he expreſſeth by that word. I ſhould think it very unjuſt if I ſhould report all of my brother, which may be ſaid of him Improperly. If *David* ſay, *All men are Lyars*, meaning, not able to help in time of need, and therefore not to be truſted in, as being fallacious; may I therefore call every man that I ſpeak with a Liar? What is there that may not be ſpoken of you truly

truly in Impropriety? But ſuppoſe you would have made the worſt of my words that malice could have done without expreſs falſhood, ſhould you not then have taken up with my own words, without the addition of your forgeries? I ſaid that [This is Improperly called Merit,] But I never ſaid that [our works are the Meritorious Cauſes of Juſtification or ſalvation.] For as I have ſtill maintained that they are No Cauſes at all, ſo in ſaying that they are called Merit Improperly, I ſay, they are no Cauſes Meritorious: no more then a *Cauſa ſine qua non* is a true Cauſe, becauſe it is Improperly ſo called. Nay I never once ſaid, that as to our Juſtification begun, that works are ſo much as exiſtent, but alwaies maintained that we are truly and fully as from all ſins paſt Juſtified by faith, before Works of externall obedience are in being.

The next words [" and in no other ſenſe do the Papiſts affirm it,] is another notorious falſhood: which if it were in Doctrinals only, I could anſwer it with a cold *Negatur*; but thus to multiply falſhoods one after another, ſeems a ſad practice from a godly man. He might well know, if indeed he know what the Papiſts hold, that they are of ſeveral parties among themſelves differing about this Point, yet all of them except *Waldenſis*, or very few more, do maintain the fitneſs of the word Merit: moſt aſſert both Merit of Congruity before Regeneration, and Merit of Condignity after; and *Scotus* and a few more that reduce all to the right by promiſe are rejected by the reſt, who affirm a Merit of value or proportion: And our own Divines generally approve of them that hold only *Meritum ex pacto*, as to the thing, denying only the fitneſs of the name, and that this is any proper Merit. This all Divines know to be true that have read the Papiſts writings and ours againſt them. And yet this man did not fear to ſay, that [in no other ſenſe do the Papiſts affirm it,] yea and that I [give as much to Works and leſs to Chriſt then the Papiſts:] I ſhall purpoſely delay my particular proof of the contrary till I ſpeak to M^r *Crandon*.

Nay a little before he ſaith of me [" Its like he thinks, that the Papiſts are " much neerer the line of truth then any of them,] *i.e.* of all the Proteſtant Churches. Here are two ſins as evident as his ſenſe, *viz.* falſe-ſpeaking and uncharitableneſs.

A little before he ſaid, he [" feareth the men of *Kederminſter* are fed but with lit- " tle better food,] yet did this man never hear me preach, never ſee my face, and yet can cenſure my teaching! Nay had he but enquired of me, he might have learned how little I meddle with Controverſie in the Pulpit: Or if I did, and did all erroneouſly, yet I read the Scripture to them, I publiſh the doctrine of the Creed and Catechiſme, is all this *poiſon or choaky meat* as he ſpeaks? Judge of the affection and practice of this man by the Apoſtles marks, 1 *Cor.* 13.3,4,5,6,7. and ſee what Charity he hath: *Charity thinketh no evil:* But how much of his own ſurmiſing hath he vented in a few lines? And yet he proceeds as freſh and fearleſs as before.

For he adds [" I muſt needs ſay, I never met with that Papiſt, which cals " Chriſt a *ſine qua non* (*i.e.* a Cauſe which effects nothing) of our Juſtification.]

Rep. Would you not think here that the man did intimate that I ſay this, and but this of Chriſt? But mark the Caſe. In *Theſ.* 56. *p.* 215. I ſpeak only of Chriſts ſatisfaction, and not of any other work of Chriſt: And I ſay that it hath ſeveral waies of Cauſing our Juſtification. 1. That it is the Meritorious Cauſe, I ſay, I know few but Socinians will deny. 2. That it is alſo the Principal Cauſe *ſine qua non*, as Removing Impediments: withall I ſhew, that I ſo call it

only

only in reſpect of its Phyſical operation, but as to Moral Dignity, I plead for its preheminence. Now what doth this man but lay down this word alone, that I call Chriſt the *Cauſa ſine qua non*, and leave out that I call his ſatisfaction the Meritorious Cauſe, and allow it the preheminence in Moral reſpect. Nay mark that himſelf makes Iuſtification to be from Eternity, and not at all Cauſed or procured by Chriſts death *quoad actum volentis*, but only *quoad rem volitam*: And let any man tell me what he can poſſibly aſcribe to Chriſts ſatisfaction on thoſe terms more then I do in the place that he carps at. Thoſe things that are but *Cauſa ſine qua non in ſenſu phyſico*, are of ſingular Moral Cauſality, and ſo I ſhewed that Chriſts death is; but that faith is ſo a *cauſa ſine qua non*, as to have no Moral Cauſality at all, as being but the Accepting of a free Gift. Theſe things are ſo far from Popery, that they accord with the opinions of his own Patrons, as expreſſed hereabouts, and yet this man ſaith he never met with Papiſt that ſaid ſo.

He next proceeds to compare my doctrine with ſome Poſitions of *Gardiners* in *Foxes Martyrology*. I have not the book at this time in my ſtudy to examine his dealing, but to his Poſitions I ſhall anſwer particularly, thus. 1. All the effects of Chriſts Paſſion have not a Condition: The ſatisfaction of Iuſtice, the making of the New Covenant, the ſealing it with Miracles, the publiſhing it to the world, and preaching it now to any Nation or Perſon, and the firſt Grace of faith and repentance; all theſe are given abſolutely, and not made over upon any Condition on mans part. But Iuſtification, Remiſſion, Adoption and Salvation, are given Conditionally. 2. His ſecond Poſition hath its anſwer in the firſt. 3. The third is falſe; for faith is the Condition it ſelf, and not ſomewhat antecedent by which we muſt know it, unleſs he ſpeak of any common faith which helpeth a man to perceive the need of ſaving faith; or unleſs he ſpeak of the Condition of our Glorification or Iuſtification as conſummate, which is ſincere obedience, in ſubſerviency to faith and concomitancy with it. 4. To the fourth, I will believe that faith is the Gift of God, if all the Papiſts living believe it, and that by this Gift, I do well in believing in order of nature, but not of time, before I am Juſtified. 5. And ſo that I do well toward the attainment of Juſtification; But not of juſtification in the Popiſh ſenſe, which comprehendeth ſanctification even in the firſt act, for ſo I do not well before it, ſo as any of my actions are Accepted of God in Chriſt, and their infirmities pardoned; but only as an unbeliever may comparatively be ſaid to do wel in coming to hear the word, rather then in going to an Alehouſe. 6. I believe that Faith and Charity thrive together, I am a Papiſt if this be Popery; that Faith works by Love. I do not think it ſound doctrine, that to the Attainment of juſtification is required Faith and Charity, without limitations and explication: For though a Love to Chriſt the Object is eſſential to that Faith that muſt accept him (for let men ſay what they will, Chriſt muſt be accepted as Good, and Good cannot be accepted without Love,) yet Charity uſually ſignifies that Grace, as extended to all other objects of Love, as well as an offered Chriſt, and ſo the Propoſition is falſe underſtood of our firſt being juſtified, as the word *Attainment* ſhews it is. 8. The eighth Propoſition is falſe. If only the beginning be free, then the reſt is not free. 9. The ninth is anſwered in the former. 10. The tenth I never heard Proteſtant deny in *ſenſu diviſo*; I believe that God gives the grace of Repentance to men in deadly ſin, even to all that have it, and I know not elſe how they ſhould have it, and that this Repentance is a Condition of juſtification, in the Pro-

teſtant ſenſe, but not in the Popiſh ſenſe, that is, of the firſt renewing of our natures: And now Brother I would I had given you all I have in the world, yea twenty lives, if I had ſo many to lay down, on condition you could but make it good, that the Papiſts erre no more then this; yea no more then theſe words of *Gardiners* in their obvious ſenſe. But if you would be believed in crediting the Papiſts, you muſt get you Readers that never read their writings, or that have read none but ſuch as the late *Chriſtian Moderator*, that tells you by Merit they mean nothing but rewardableneſs. If you will make all the Papiſts Orthodox to prove me a Papiſt, youl ſhew how much your extremities hurt their Cauſe. For my part I ſay again, would I had loſt my life ſo that it were true. I would no more remove from the truth becauſe the Papiſts own it, then I would deny God becauſe they profeſs him. And if you can make me believe that the Papiſts are as Orthodox men as you pretend them to be, you will but exceedingly glad my heart, and not a whit remove me from my own opinion. Theſe be but words to affright ſuch children that receive their faith on the credit of man, and that muſt know what the Papiſts hold, that they may be contrary, before they can tell what to hold themſelves. Theſe move not men that wait for the Law at the mouth of Chriſt, and that attend the Spirit of Illumination by the ſtudy of the word, and go to the Law and to the Teſtimony, and call no man Maſter on earth. The worſt you can do by ſuch Toyes of malice, are but to diminiſh my reputation, with factious men, that follow parties for their faith, and know not what the Unity of the faith means, nor what it is to depend for teaching upon Chriſt. Though theſe men may be godly and zealous, and ſuch as I dearly love, yet were it not for being made uncapable of doing them good, and diminiſhing Gods intereſt and their benefit, by the diminution of mine, I think you would not much aſſault me with theſe weapons, if you knew how little I value their eſteem, when I cannot have it with Innocency and Truth. Brother, I am proud and ſinful the Lord knows as well as others: but yet I can truly ſay, that I have bent my ſtudies and vigilancy againſt the ſin of pride above moſt others, for divers years paſt, and that I have ſtood ſo long on the brink of the grave and the door of eternity, that I can with very little trouble bear all the quarrels and contempts of men. How ſmall a matter is it to me to be judged by man, who am daily looking to be called to the bar of God? I am almoſt out of this wrangling cenſorious world, and know its Gods Approbation which I muſt ſtand by, and then think of me all as you pleaſe; if God juſtifie me, I care not for your condemning me. But you proceed.

[" And for his choice notion of Juſtification by Works as they are our new " Covenant-Righteouſneſs, I find it was a ſhift of the Papiſts long ago, &c.]

Rep. You are very unfit to parallel the Papiſts and me, who for ought I perceive underſtand neither of us. I need not tell Divines that read them, the Papiſts opinion: but for my own, I ſay ſtill, that we are juſtified firſt, without ſo much as the preſence of Works, and finally without their Cauſality: but yet had rather expound *James*, then deny the truth of his words. Nor do I acknowledge any Univerſall Righteouſneſs but Chriſts, conſiſting in the remiſſion of ſins. Onely I think not that Chriſt died to pardon my Faith and Love, as ſuch, but to pardon the infirmity of them: to forgive my ſins, as ſins, and not my duty, as duty, and therefore that we have a particular Righteouſneſs by which in ſubordination to Chriſts, as being only the Condition of our Enjoying it, we may be ſaid to be juſtified. But of theſe things more fully God willing hereafter.

He adds ["I ſhall not trace Mr. *B.* any further, there being now in the Preſs,

"as

"as I am informed, a large and full Anſwer to his Paradoxicall Aphoriſms, by a "faithful ſervant of the Lord Ieſus, Mr. *Crandon* of *Fawley* in *Hampſhire*, a Work-"man that need not be aſhamed.]

Rep. Of this book I have ſpoke in the Epiſtle enough. Why ſpeak you of it as a ſtrange matter [as I am informed?] Its long ſince I was informed of your being with him at *London*, as combined together in the ſame Cauſe, and promoting each others work; one againſt Mr. *Woodbridge*, the other againſt me.

Your next ſhews your modeſty, in calling ſuch books ["far more dangerous "then the Ranters Blaſphemous Pamphlets] and imitating that they are Popiſh and Arminian, and how *Reignolds*, *Whittakers*, *Davenant*, *Prideaux* would not have endured them.] Would you make the world believe that theſe men were of your minde for the Iuſtification of Infidels? Truly if you will be of the ſame minde as theſe men were, though I may differ from you in ſome point of Method or Words, yet I will never oppoſe you nor write againſt you, if you wil but give me leave to forbear. My differences with theſe men are nothing to my differences with you. Nay you might have known if you would, that *Davenant* maintains the Conditionality of ſincere obedience to the Continuance of our Iuſtification in the ſame terms as I do. And ſo much to your Epiſtle. Now to your Treatiſe.

---

§. 2.

THe firſt place that I obſerve you falling on me, is *Pag.* 25. about *Maccovius*, where you ſay ["Though one of our late writers, (Mr *B. App. p.* 147.) men-"tions this Doctors opinion with much contempt and oſcitancy, calling his As-"ſertions ſtrange, ſenſleſs and abhorred (which is the leſs to be regarded) ſeeing "he uſually metes out the ſame meaſure unto all men elſe, whoſe Notions do not "ſquare with his own mold.]

Rep. Thou ſhalt not bear falſe witneſs againſt thy neighbour. My words of *Maccovius* doctrine I refer to the conſideration of any that are impartial: for my part I cannot repent of them, any more then for ſaying that whoredom or drunkenneſs are to be abhorred. But that I [uſually mete out the ſame meaſure to all men elſe whoſe Notions ſquare not with my mold,] is a groſs untruth, which any man that converſeth with me, and hath read my writings, may quickly know. But let's hear your proof.

["As Dr. *Twiſs*, Mr. *Walker*, and them that hold the Imputation of Chriſts "active Righteouſneſs, whom he calls, A ſort of Ignorant and unſtudied "Divines, *&c.*

Rep. Divers more groſs falſhoods in theſe few words, are added to the reſt. I am loath to call you Antinomian, but if the ninth Commandment be Law, I am ſure you make as bold to break it, if that be Antinomianiſm, as moſt that I have dealt with. 1. Why did you not quote the place where I [mete out the ſame meaſure] to Dr. *Twiſs*? Mr. *Kendal* accuſeth me of ſleighting him indeeed; and what is my language? why I call him [that moſt excellent famous Divine.] But I judge him to miſtake in ſaying Remiſſion of ſin is from eternity: that is, I judge him not Infallible nor free from error: Thus Proteſtants abuſe all men, and Papiſts all ſave the Pope and his General Council. 2. For Mr. *Walker*, I confeſs I ſpoke undiſcreetly, as having no call to meddle with him, and I hereby revoke it, and do repent it, that I intimated him to be *Ignorant*, and that I medled with his *Reviling*:

But yet I will take no man for a competent Judge of my fault, that hath not read his Book againſt Mr. *Goodwin*, and Mr. *Gataker's* Book againſt him in Defence of Mr. *Wotton*. 3. It is here intimated, that the cauſe of my ſpeech was his differing from my mold: that is, as he means my opinions (for indeed the Scripture is my mold: Whereas the reaſon of my words againſt Mr. *Walker*, was his exceeding hard language to his Brethren; which as being againſt love and peace, I ſo far reprehended, as to ſay [He ſtrongly reviled and weakly diſputed] when in diſcourſe and Pulpit he had done ſo much for above 20 years, againſt ſuch learned, choice ſervants of God, as Mr. *Wotton*, Mr. *Bradſhaw*, &c. and when in the Preſs the term Heretick, Blaſphemer, &c. are ſo familiar; and he even proceeds to the Curſe of Anathema Maran-atha. But what if I ſpoke unreverendly to this Reverend man, in ſaying he reviled? is it juſt that I be accuſed of doing ſo to all men, or any others, when I never was guilty? 4. Next I am charged with the like, as to [" them that hold the Imputation of Chriſts active Righteouſneſs.] Another falſhood, as thus without limitation expreſſed: For I there profeſſed to hold it my ſelf, as part of ſatisfaction, and I hold it as Meritorious of all that higher felicity then the firſt Covenant gave (if there by any ſuch:) But it was only one ſort or ſenſe of Imputation there explained which I ſpoke againſt. 5. Another untruth it is, that I [call theſe, A ſort of ignorant unſtudied Divines:] The words are theſe [" The maintainers of it, beſide ſome Able men, are the vulgar ſort of un-" ſtudied Divines, who having not ability or diligence to ſearch deep into ſo pro-" found a Controverſie, do ſtill hold that opinion which is moſt common and in " credit.] Where I divide thoſe that are for this way into two ſorts: ſome Able men, and others the common unſtudied Divines that take it on credit: And this is a known truth that too many ſuch there are, that ſo receive even much of their Religion: As if you did not think ſo your ſelf of the moſt that are againſt your particular opinion? Do you not think they go for company againſt you? So I do not call all *Ignorant* that go that way, nor any man becauſe he goes that way.

You add of *Maccovius* [" I dare ſay his Arguments in this particular will not " ſeem ſo weak and ridiculous as Mr. *Baxter* makes them, to an indifferent reader " that ſhall compare them with the exceptions that he hath ſhaped unto them. Sharp Cenſures are but dull Anſwers.]

Repl. I am not deſirous to blaſt the reputation of that Learned man, if I were of any power to do it. But I confeſs his Doctrine in the matter of Juſtification I would have all friends of mine avoid; and I took it for my duty ſo to tell them: which I know not why you ſhould be ſo offended at. I ſuppoſe you know how the Synod of *Dort* judged of his harſh language in another caſe, wherein he oppoſed *Lubbertus*.

And ſeeing I am thus brought to take notice of the Witneſſes that you produce as for your Cauſe; give me leave a little to review them.

The firſt is Mr *Pemble*: But as Mr. *Pemble* is for you in his *Vind. Grat.* ſo when he came purpoſely to treat of that ſubject, it ſeems he changed his judgement: For in his *Treat. of Juſtification*, he ſaith as much of that as moſt of your adverſaries: I pray you read him *Pag.* 15. *c.* 2. & *p.* 22, 23, 24, 57. and then you will ſure boaſt of M. *Pemble* no more: If he were once of your mind and afterward rejected it, as he ſeems fully to have done, that is no great credit to it.

Your ſecond is Mr. *Rutherford*, who you ſay hath ſaid as much as any of you. Wil you give the Reader leave to judge how far M. *Rutherford* was for you, by theſe words of his own, written after a fuller knowledge of the men of your Sect; In his

Trial

Trial and Triumph of Faith, pag. 55. Serm. 8. he anſwers theſe Objections (againſt his firſt words, wherein he aſſerteth that [The condition of the Covenant is faith : Holineſs and ſanctification the Condition of the Covenants.) *This do* was the condition of the Covenant of Works ; *This Believe* is the condition of this Covenant.]

[*Object.* 1. But ſome teach that this Covenant hath no Condition at all, ſo Dr. *Criſpe* and other Libertines.] [*Obj.* 2. *I will put my law in your inward parts*, is no condition to be performed by us, but by God only.] [*Obj.* 4. Believing and obedience is but a conſequent of the Covenant, not an Antecedent: ſo I muſt believe upon other grounds, but not in way of the condition of the Covenant, for in that tenor I am to do nothing.] [*Obj.* 5. The Covenant is Gods love to man to take him to himſelf, and that before the children do good or ill, and to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt.] [*Ob.* 6. Our act of believing is a work, and no work can be a condition of the Covenant of grace : yea Chriſt alone juſtifieth : Faith is not Chriſt, nor any partner with him in the work; yea we are juſtified before we believe, and faith only ſerveth for the manifeſtation of Juſtification to our conſcience, for we believe no lie, when we believe we are juſtified, but a truth ; then it muſt be true, that we are juſtified before we believe.] Theſe Mr. *Rutherford* anſwers as the Libertines Objections. It would be too tedious to recite his Anſwers, only ſome of that to the laſt I will recite.

He ſaith, *p.* 59, 60, 61, 62. [Chriſt alone as the meritorious cauſe juſtifieth, and his imputed Righteouſneſs as the formal cauſe : and this way Chriſt alone juſtifieth the Patriarchs, &c. and all believers before they be born, but this is but the fountain ready to waſh : but believe it Chriſt waſheth not, while we be foul, &c. nor is his name *our Righteouſneſs* while we be ſinners (*i.e.* unrenewed.) 1. Men not born cannot be the object of actual Righteouſneſs; the unborn child needeth no actual application of Chriſts eye-ſalve, gold, righteouſneſs : Now Juſtification is a real favour applied to us in time, juſt as Sanctification in the New birth, &c. We cannot be juſtified before we believe. 1. We are damned before we believe, *Joh.* 3. 2. He that is juſtified is glorified, *Rom.* 8. 30. 3. We are born and by nature the ſons of wrath, *Eph.* 2. 2, 7. *Rom.* 7. 5, 6. & 6. 14. 4. By faith we are only united to Chriſt, poſſeſſed of him, Chriſt dwelling in us, &c. 5. This Juſtification without faith caſteth looſe the Covenant, *I will be your God* : But here's a condition, God is not bound and we free : Therefore this is the other part, *Ye ſhall be my people*. Now it is taught by Libertines, that there can be no cloſing with Chriſt in a promiſe that hath a qualification or condition expreſſed, and that conditional Promiſes are Legal, &c. (Here he rejecteth Conditions, 1. In the Arminian ſenſe, as they are the work of Free-will not acted by the predetermining grace of Chriſt. 2. In the Popiſh ſenſe, as they are meritorious, as work of wages : and ſo I reiect them too.) 6. *Paul* in the Epiſtles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, takes it for granted that Iuſtification is a work done in time, tranſient on us, not an immanent and eternal action, remaining either in God from eternity, or performed by Chriſt on the Croſs before we believe, and ſo never taketh on him to prove that we are juſtified before we either do the works of the Law, or believe in Ieſus Chriſt, but that we are Iuſtified by faith, &c. and faith is not the naked Manifeſtation of our Iuſtification, ſo as we are Iuſtified before we have faith: Satisfaction is indeed given to Iuſtice by Chriſt on the Croſs, for all our ſins before we believe, and before any juſtified perſon who lived this 1500 years was born ; but, alas, that is not Iuſtification, but only the meritori-

ous cauſe of it: that is, as if one ſhould ſay, This wall is white ſince the Creation of the world, though this very day only it was whited, becauſe whiteneſs was in the world ſince the Creation.

And that you may know the true nature of Juſtification, and Mr. *Kendall* and you may ſee what others ſay of the nature of the act as well as Mr. *Woodbridge* and I, mark the next words [Juſtification is a Forenſical ſentence in time pronounced *in the Goſpel*, and applied to *me Now*, and never till the inſtant now, that I believe: Its not formally an act of the underſtanding to know a truth concerning my ſelf; But its an heart-adherence of the affections to Chriſt as the Saviour of ſinners, at the preſence of which a ſentence of free abſolution is pronounced: Suppoſe the Prince have it in his minde to pardon twenty malefactors; his grace is the cauſe why they are pardoned, yet are they never *in Law* pardoned, ſo as they can *in Law* plead immunity, till they can produce their Princes royal ſealed pardon.] So Serm. 18. *pag.* 148. [Nay give me leave to ſay, that Antinomians make Iuſtification and free grace their common place of Divinity, as if they onely had ſeen the viſions of the Almighty and no other, but they are utterly ignorant thereof: For they confound and mix what the word diſtinguiſheth, becauſe *Juſtification is onely a Removal of ſin by a Law-way, ſo that in Law* it cannot actually condemn.] So *pag.* 151. [Iuſtification freeth *us in this life from all Law guilt and Obligation* to wrath, which is but the ſecond act of ſin.] So *pag.* 153. [All which are true in a Law-ſenſe, and in a Legal and Moral freedom from ſin, *&c.*] and [for they are in their actual guilt as touching the *Law ſting*, and power, as no ſins, *&c.* removed and taken away *quoad actualem reatum eternæ mortis*, in their Law-demerit and guilt, *&c.* This is a Law removal of ſin.] So oft *pag.* 154. *& paſſim:* & *p.* 162. ſpeaking of Chriſts ſufferings [This threefold taking away of ſins I clear from Scripture. 1. Chriſt taketh away our ſins on the Croſs *Cauſatively*, and by way of merit, whileas he ſuffereth for our ſins on the Croſs. So *Joh.* 1. 29. 1 *Cor.* 5. 21. 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. *Iſa.* 53. 10. Now this was the paying of a ranſom for us, and a Legal tranſlation of the eternal puniſhment of our ſins, but it is not Iuſtification, nor ever called Iuſtification: there is a ſort of imputation of ſin to Chriſt here, and a ſumme paid for me; but, with leave, No *formall imputation*, no forenſical, and no perſonal Law-reckoning to me who am not yet born, far leſs cited before a Tribunal, and abſolved from ſin; When Chriſt had compleatly paid this ſumme, Chriſt was juſtified Legally, as a publique perſon, and all his ſeed *Fundamentally*, *Meritoriouſly*, *Cauſatively*, but not in their perſons. There is a ſecond removal of ſin, when the believer is juſtified by faith This which is formally the Iuſtification of the believing ſinner, the Believers perſon is Accepted, Reconciled, Iuſtified, and really tranſlated by a *Law change*, from one ſtate to another.]

I have been the longer in reciting Mr. *Rutherford's* words, 1. Becauſe of themſelves they ſuffice to confute your Opinion. 2. Becauſe you ſo talk of [the Proteſtant Divines and Churches,] and yet of thoſe few that you produce for you, it may appear what they judge of your Cauſe. 3. That your allegations may be underſtood hereafter by your Reader.

Your third Dr. *Twiſs*, and alſo *Maccovius* I acknowledge are for you in the point now in queſtion.

Mr. *Parker's* words imply no more then *Rutherfords*, *viz.* That in Chriſts Iuſtification we were juſtified *cauſally*; but that is a term of diminution, as to the formal Iuſtification; for till it be *extra cauſas*, it doth not exiſt: and it is an improper uſe of the word Juſtification.

Cha-

Chamier I have oft noted to have ſome paſſages that make for your Opinion: but that he contradicteth them elſewhere, I think is not hard to manifeſt. I will not deny the truth for the credit of the man.

Calvin is ſo expreſs and frequent againſt you, as few men more. I came but now from citing ſome paſſages to that end againſt *Ludiomæus Colvinus*, and therefore will not now loſe time in doing it again, when all men that will reade his Books, may quickly finde that he was no friend to the Juſtification of Infidels. I marvell rather that you had not cited *Zuinglius*, who indeed is blamed for leaning that way, and called *Seneca* by ſuch a Chriſtian name unleſs perhaps he was deceived by *Hierome*, as *Hierome* was by his counterfeit Epiſtle, and thought *Seneca* a believer indeed) And you might have alleadged an inclination in *Eraſmus* for you, who could ſcarce forbear ſaying, *Sancte Socrates ora pro nobis*. *Calvin*'s words mean but this much (which you cite) that ſeeing God offereth Remiſſion, and we do but Accept it by faith, therefore God doing his part in offering it, he ſaith that *reſpectu Dei Juſtificatio fidem præcedit*, though we are not actually juſtified till after. For that offer is common to Infidels. In that very diſcourſe *Calvin* hath many paſſages againſt you: As *pag.* (*mihi fol.*) 390. *Nos autem meminerimus fidei naturam à Chriſto æſtimandam eſſe: quia quod nobis offert Deus in Chriſto, non niſi fide recipimus. Proinde quicquid nobis eſt Chriſtus id ad fidem transfertur, quæ nos compotes & Chriſti & omnium ejus bonorum facit. Neq; aliter verum eſſet illud Johannis, fidem noſtram eſſe victoriam, qua mundus vincitur, niſi nos in Chriſtum inſereret qui ſolus eſt mundi victor.*]

Zanchy in the words cited by you uſeth inconvenient expreſſions; but that he is fully againſt you, is manifeſt in many places of his Writing. But I have newly Vindicated *Zanchy* from *Ludiomæus Colvinus*, who urgeth the ſame words as you do.

So I have done *Alſtedius* too, and therefore ſhall ſay no more of him.

So alſo have I vindicated *Ameſius* againſt the ſame *Colvinus*: and as for this teſtimony which you adde more then he, *viz. ex Antiſynodal.* p. 164. his [*aliquo modo*] *in favorem reſtituti*, by which he there expoundeth reconciliation, is ſo ſtretching a word, as may well be yielded true: for it will let in as improper a reconciliation as yours: but yet *Ameſius* will not uſe the word Juſtification ſo improperly, at leaſt without diſcovering the impropriety.

---

§. 3.

THe next bout that you have with me, is *pag.* 25. when you have done with Mr. *Burgeſs*. And you there fall on to ſome purpoſe, thus: "[Mr. *Baxter*'s character of an Antinomian will bring all our Proteſtant Writers under "this cenſure.]

Repl. Still more falſhood! Is the ninth Commandment blotted out of your Decalogue, as the ſecond out of the Papiſts? Or think you that you are under no Law; or that God ſees no iniquity in you, ſo as to hate it?

But let's hear your proof. "[For with him they are Antinomians who hold "(1.) That our Evangelical Righteouſneſs is without us in Chriſt, or performed "by him and not by our ſelves]

Repl. Here are more untruths then one in theſe words alſo. 1. I never ſaid that they who denied this were Antinomians, but that it was a piece of Antino-

mian

mian doctrine, and that the Antinomians did deny it: Nay leſt any ſhould think that I accounted all Antinomians that are offended at this; I added [and ſome that are no Antinomians, &c. p. 109.] I call not all Antinomians that hold any one of their doctrines. 2. It is untrue that all our Proteſtant Writers are againſt this, (as I have fully ſhewed elſewhere) yea or any one accounted Orthodox that ever I met with, as to the ſenſe of my words: For though ſome of them will not allow the name of *Righteouſneſs* to our faith and obedience (though the Scripture uſeth it twenty and twenty times I think) and others commonly will call it Righteouſneſs, but will not ſay that we are righteous or juſtified by it. (A ſtrange Righteouſneſs that doth not make righteous *formaliter*, as it is a ſtrange exiſtent whiteneſs, that makes no man white, and a ſtrange honeſty or goodneſs, or nobility, that makes no man honeſt, good or noble:) yet do all the Proteſtants that ever I met with yield to my explicatory Propoſition, which I purpoſely annexed, that none might miſtake me and quarrell about words, *viz.* [Though Chriſt performed the conditions of the Law and ſatisfied for our *non* performance, yet it is our ſelves that muſt perform the conditions of the Goſpel,] *i. e.* by the grace of God. Who deny this but your own Sect, and a few Divines, that in that point joyn with you in making the New Covenant to have no Condition: who are but very few indeed comparatively. Nay of the very Libertines, the firſt that I remember that taught men when they doubted of the truth of their faith or repentance, to comfort themſelves with this perſwaſion, that Chriſt hath believed and repented for them, was *Saltmarſh*; againſt whom Mr. *Gataker* hath told you more truth then I perceive you are willing to learn. 3. Here is added to theſe open untruths a ſecret calumny: For you deliver it in general terms, as if I did hold that which Divines commonly call our Evangelicall Righteouſneſs to be in our ſelves and not in Chriſt. When as I purpoſely explained my ſelf, to avoid all ſtrife about words, that as Chriſts Righteouſneſs is called Evangelical, becauſe the Goſpel revealeth and giveth it; ſo our righteouſneſs Evangelical is without us. This you hide, to make the Reader that ſeeth but your words, to think that I hold ſome monſtrous thing. Be it known therefore to you and all men, That I truſt on that Righteouſneſs of Chriſt which is without me Materially, and formally conſiſteth in *my Right to Impunity and to the Kingdom of Glory*; and that I acknowledge no righteouſneſs within me conſiſting in faith, repentance or obedience, but onely A particular Righteouſneſs required by the new Covenant in meer ſubordination to Chriſts Righteouſneſs, as the condition on which it is made ours; which is firſt in order of nature a meer condition of our full righteouſneſs in Chriſt, and then ſecondarily a particular Righteouſneſs it ſelf, when the Cauſe comes to trial, Whether we did perform that condition or not? If you do not underſtand theſe few words, I intreate you either to ſtudy them till you do, or elſe forbear any more to reproach that which you underſtand not: and do not intimate me to be an Infidel, in denying Chriſts Righteouſneſs.

You proceed, "[Or (2.) that Juſtification is a free act of God without any "condition on our part for the obtaining of it.]

Rep. This is in ſenſe the ſame with the former. Here alſo is more untruths then one intimated or expreſſed (I confeſs they fall ſo thick from you, that I doubt I ſhall be thought a railer by your party, and too ſharp by others, for numbring them to you, and deſiring you to repent.) 1. I onely ſaid that [the Antimonians think grace cannot be free if there be any condition on our part for enjoying it.] But doth it follow, that becauſe I ſay, [the Antinomians ſay ſo] that therefore I

ſay

ſay [they are Antinomians who do ſay ſo.] The Papiſts ſay, Epiſcopacy is a ſuperiour order to Presbyterie: but [they are not therefore Papiſts that ſhall ſo ſay, unleſs there be ſomewhat elſe ſo to denominate them.] 2. Do not all the Learned men into whoſe hands your Book ſhall fall, know that it is falſe, that the Proteſtants do hold the opinion which I here call Antinomian? Do not the Confeſſions of the Churches, and the generality of Divines make faith the condition of the Covenant, and yet maintain it to be free? If you will ſpeak untruths hereafter, for your credit ſake, do it more modeſtly and warily, and open not your ſhame in the ſight of the world. It were no great wiſdom in me on this occaſion to heap up the Teſtimonies of Churches and Divines, in a caſe ſo well known.

You adde, "[Or elſe (3.) that Iuſtification is an immanent act, and conſequently from eternity, which was the judgement of *Alſted*, *Pemble*, *Twiſs*, *Rutherford*, &c.]

Rep. I think there are at leaſt two untruths and a half here too. 1. Whether it were *Rutherford*'s judgement, let the Reader judge by what is written out of him before. 2. Of *Alſted* I ſpeak as afore I ſaid againſt *Colvinus*. 3. It is half true of *Pemble*, in that he was once of that opinion, and but half true, becauſe in his Treat. of *Iuſtification* he fully aſſerteth ours. 4. What are theſe four men to all the Proteſtant Writers which you affirmed I would bring under this cenſure?

You adde, "[Or (4.) that we muſt not perform duty for life and ſalvation, "but from life and ſalvation: or that we muſt not make the attaning of Juſtification or ſalvation the end of our endeavours, but obey in Thankfulneſs, and becauſe "we are juſtified and ſaved. *&c.*]

Rep. 1. In the place quoted page 14. is no ſuch thing in any of the four Editions of that Book. But I well remember the ſenſe of moſt of it about p. 10. or 11. and that I largely prove it in the Appendix of my *Aphor.* 2. But indeed dare you ſay, that all (or any) Proteſtant Writers do hold this Point? Now God forbid! If they did, I profeſs ſeriouſly I would ſcarce be called a Proteſtant, if they held but that one Error alone. Did not you know in this Point, that not onely Learned men, but the ordinary ſort of Chriſtians can diſprove you? I appeal to all honeſt men, women and children of underſtanding, that uſe to reade *Dod*, *Bolton*, *Perkins*, *Preſton*, *Hooker*, *Rogers*, *Wheatly*, &c. What ſay you Sirs? Do theſe Writers teach you that you muſt uſe no endeavours for your ſalvation? that you muſt do nothing for eternal life? Nay do they teach you that the very unregenerate muſt do nothing to obtain the life of grace? 3. Truly I hoped well in the beginning that you had not been neer ſo far gone your ſelf, as to own this deſperate opinion. The Lord keep you from practiſing it, or, I think, you are a loſt man. 4. Yet let me tell you, that I further believe, 1. That thankfulneſs and Love ſhould be the chiefeſt ſpring of duty 2. Yea even with the unregenerate, our firſt labour ſhould be when we have convinced them of ſin and miſery, and the truth of the Goſpel, to poſſeſs them with thanks and love for that common redemption, which I ſuppoſe you deny; I mean there is matter in Chriſts common love in his ſatisfaction, for us to plead with ſinners for gratitude (before aſſurance of ſpecial love) though they have no hearts to perceive it to purpoſe, till God open their hearts by his Spirit: 3. The principle of our new ſpiritual life is it that Chriſtians muſt act from, in their whole courſe. Thus far I ſay we muſt act from life and love. 4. And alſo, from Gods love antecedent to ours.

You conclude, *Now let any man who is moderately verſed in our Proteſtant writers but ſpeak on whom this Arrow falls: I might inſtance in many others, but I will not put the Reader to ſo much trouble.*

Rep. Now let any man who hath read the ninth Commandment, and the words of Chriſt, *By their fruits ye ſhall know them*, judge. 1. Whether it be not his duty to lament the ſinful ſtate of this Brother, and to pray God to forgive him (though I know not whether he will pray ſo for himſelf.) 2. And to pitty poor Chriſtians that ſhall hear and reade the confident words of ſuch men, and have not means to diſcern their vanity. 3. And judge whether that be not a bad opinion that can entangle even a godly man in ſuch a courſe of ſin: And whether we ought not all to take heed of believing that we are juſtified before we were born, or that we ought to do nothing for our own ſalvation; or that pardon is given without any condition, ſo much as Acceptance. For my part I impute theſe faults to the Opinion firſt, and to the man but as from thence. And it may be Gods will to permit him to practice according to the tendency of his doctrine, even in the Book wherein he maintaineth it, that thoſe that cannot underſtand his errors in themſelves, may *ſee* them in their effects.

---

§. 4.

THe next bout that you have with me, you begin thus, *pag.* 29. *He may if he will compare his doctrine with Mr.* Baxter's *notions* (*whom Mr.* W. *follows at the very heels*) Theſ. 56. 26. 73, *&c. in his* Aph. *who denies, That Chriſts obedience is the material, the imputation of his Righteouſneſs the formall cauſe of our Iuſtification, or that faith is the inſtrument by which we do receive it.*

Rep. What an unhappy name is mine to your mouth, that is ſeldom mentioned without ſin! 1. I did not deny Chriſts obedience to be the material cauſe in the ſenſe as Divines commonly ſo called it; and therefore not abſolutely & without explication, as you recite it: But 1. As matter is proper to ſubſtance, ſo juſtification being an accident hath no matter. Are not you of the ſame minde? 2. As accidents do inhere in the ſubject, ſo the ſubject is commonly called their matter: In this ſenſe too our Righteouſneſs or Juſtification paſſive is not in Chriſts Righteouſneſs, but in our ſelves, and ſo our ſelves are the matter: for I think it is we that are juſtified Nor do I believe yet that it is one act whereby Chriſt and we are juſtified. There is then no other proper matter of our Juſtification (the later being not properly ſo called it ſelf.) 3. But yet as our Divines commonly call Chriſts Righteouſneſs of ſatisfaction the matter of ours, becauſe it is the matter that merited it, ſo am I well content to do, and ſo I willingly profeſs that our righteouſneſs is materially out of us, in Chriſts ſatisfaction: and therefore I there ſaid that they ſpeak nearer the matter that call it [the matter of our righteouſneſs] then they that call it the matter of our active Juſtification.

2. Your next charge is, that I deny Imputation to be the form. 1. I both grant it and deny it, as you underſtand the words. I did in that place take the word Imputation in one onely ſenſe, for Donation, and ſo ſaid, it was rather in order of nature before Juſtification, *i. e.* ſententiall: and ſo ſaith many other. 2. But I would deſire you and all men to take notice that thoſe two pag. 218, 219.

I have

I have much altered, as finding the expreſſions unfit, and therefore do revoke them. And I ſay 1. That imputation is taken either for Donation or Adjudication, and that mental, by meer eſtimation, or Judicial by ſentence. 2. That Juſtification is Conſtitutive, or Sentential. And ſo I judge 1. That imputation of Chriſts Righteouſneſs taken for Donation is the form of conſtitutive Juſtification (Active Donation of Active Juſtification, and Paſſive Donation of Paſſive Juſtification.) 2. That ſentential adjudication of Chriſts Righteouſneſs to us, is the form of our ſentential Juſtification, 3. And that after the manner of men, or by extrinſick denomination *à novitate objecti*, it may be ſaid, that God doth impute righteouſneſs to us by mental eſtimation or acceptation, or approbation, when he looks on us as then Righteous and not before, and therefore may be ſaid then to begin ſo to eſteem, accept or approve us, becauſe before there was no object for an act of ſuch denomination. And this may be called the form of a mental Juſtification. So in all three ſenſes I ſay that Imputation is the form of Juſtification, but not one ſort of Imputation the form of another ſort of Juſtification; which was all that I there meant to deny, but unfitly expreſſed my mind, as in ſome other places of that Book, for which I have ever ſince ſuppreſſed it.

3. How far I deny faith to be the inſtrument, I refer the Reader to my Reply to Mr. *Blake* and Mr. *Kendall*. You a little after could ſay, You thought I argued rationally in that when it fitted your turn.

You add, *He plainly aſcribes the ſame kind of Cauſality to Chriſt and faith, making them to differ*, Only ſecundum magis & minus, *that Chriſt is the* ſine qua non principalis, *and faith the* ſine qua non minus principalis.

Rep. 1. More calumny and untruth. 1. I ſaid [*Chriſts ſatisfaction,*] you ſay *Chriſt*: as if Chriſt cauſed no other way but by ſatisfaction. 2. The word [*Only*] is your notorious forgery. 3. I did in the ſame place expreſly ſay that Chriſts ſatisfaction is the Meritorious cauſe, and *ſine qua non*, in ſeveral reſpects. 4. It was only in *ſenſu phyſico* that I called it *cauſa ſine qua non* (and ſo do your beſt friends, in ſenſe) but a moral cauſe, yea of higheſt dignity I aſſerted it to be. 5. I affirmed that faith was no moral cauſe at all. And now let the Reader judge of your Veracity, and whether you recite not my words juſt as, you know who, is commonly ſaid to have cited Scripture to Chriſt.

You adjoyn in a Parentheſis, [*He might have liſted ſin in the ſame rank, which too, is a* ſine qua non *of our Juſtification.*

Rep. 1. Every thing *ſine qua non res exiſtet*, is not *Cauſa ſine qua non*. Though this have no true cauſality, yet it is a *medium ad finem*, and hath a tendency to the effect, by which it doth ſo far emulate cauſality, that it receiveth the nature. But who ever called privation *Cauſam ſine qua non*? and yet it is *Principium ſine quo non*. Sin in being is the true cauſe of guilt: and guilt is the *materia removenda*, or the *Terminus à quo* of Juſtification, it being the very thing that Remiſſion doth deſtroy: even as life doth death, or light darkneſs. 2. What if you had ſpoke ſenſe in this? yet what had it been to the ſtrengthning of your accuſation? Would you have your Reader believe that I make ſin to be the meritorious cauſe of our Juſtification, or to have that Dignity in moral cauſation which I aſcribed to the ſatisfaction of Chriſt?

Next you ſay, *That faith and works in a larger ſenſe are meritorious cauſes of life and bleſſedneſs.*

Rep. Another falſe witneſs: I mentioned merit in a larger improper ſenſe: (as

all Divines that ever I read againſt the Papiſts on that Point do) but never called them *a Meritorious cauſe* that I know of. Why would you print ſuch things which you knew might be diſcovered? It may be you will ſay, It is all one. I anſwer, 1. You ſhould then have ſaid that I ſpeak to that ſenſe, and not that I ſpeak *ſo*: Nay you ſhould have put down my own words, and left the Reader to judge of the ſenſe, and not put your own ſenſe on them, and then ſay, I ſpeak ſo. 2. It is not all one. For in denying them to be properly Merit, I deny them to be any way cauſing by that Merit: therefore you feign me to yield to a further impropriety then I did, or elſe to falſe doctrine. 3. But will you go tell the world what is my judgement, becauſe I take the word *Merit* in the Fathers in a larger improper ſenſe? Chriſt called *Peter* Satan, for his carnal counſel: Will you determine thence that Chriſt judged *Peter* to be the Devil? *David* was *a worm and no man* in improper ſenſe: Muſt he needs be laſht by you for ſpeaking falſe doctrine in ſo ſaying? Will you accuſe Chriſt of Error for ſaying, He is the Vine, and his Father the Husbandman? He is the Way, the Door, the Shepherd, &c? The word *Reward* is oft enough uſed in Scripture, and ſo is the word [*Worthy*:] and yet you conclude they are both uſed improperly: And will you therefore ſay that Chriſt was a Papiſt, or Socinian, or Erroneous, for uſing thoſe words improperly? Having ſpoken ſo much to your Head, let me ſay this to your Heart: Brother, you engaged your ſelf in Baptiſm to fight againſt the Devil: your life is or ſhould be a continual combat againſt him: How comes it to paſs then that you have ſo learned his accuſing art, when you ſhould have learned of Chriſt to be *holy*, and to *love your brother*, and to *ſpeak the truth*? I do ſeriouſly adviſe you to repent of theſe ways, and to bethink you whether your opinions encourage you not hereto. If you reject this wholſom advice, take heed that it riſe not up againſt you in judgement, and if you proceed in ſuch courſes impenitently, take heed leſt thoſe ſins prove unpardoned hereafter, which you ſay were pardoned before you believed, or repented, or were born. Becauſe I deſire it may not be ſo, therefore do I warn you.

Pag. 30. you ſay, *Too many of our Proteſtants* (*ſetting aſide the word Merit, which yet Mr. B. thinks may be admitted*) *do tread directly in their ſteps; they aſcribe as much to works as Papiſts do.*

Rep. 1. It ſeems then other Proteſtants are as much Papiſts herein as I, in ſenſe, though not in word. 2. Another ſlander you are guilty of (I ſay Guilty, for all you ſay its pardoned before committed.) Did ever I ſay *The word Merit may be admitted.* Shew where if you can. I ſaid indeed that in that large improper ſenſe, *Works may be called Merits*, thereby intending no *Moral admiſsion* of it: but only a *capacity in the term*, to ſignifie ſuch a thing by improper uſe. But I never ſaid that it is no ſin in them that do uſe words ſo improperly, or that *it may be admitted.* For my part, I think the danger is ſo great, that the very uſe of the word is to be avoided by us, except in interpretations of others, or with them that will uſe it whether we will or not; and ſo we muſt ſpeak to men in their own language ſometime, or ſay nothing. 3. Better men then you or I, have uſed the word Merit, even the Church of Chriſt, the Councils and Fathers for 1400 years and more: And *Auſtin* that moſt eminently vindicated the glory of free grace, yet never diſuſed this word himſelf. If I have ſinned therefore but as all the Church hath done ſo long, and in its ſpring, I hope I am no Papiſt. 4. I would again have you and all men take notice how theſe overdoing men are the greateſt undoers. How could this man credit Popery more almoſt then he doth? As bad

as

as I am (which is bad I confeſs) yet if he could make all my neighbours believe that Papiſts be ſuch as I, he would do more to make them Papiſts, then ſuch arguings as this Book contains would undo. And I think ſome Rulers that now may be in the mind to deny Papiſts the liberty of their Religion, or at leaſt of preaching to others, would grant them both, if they thought that the Religion of Papiſts were no worſe then mine? So the argument would run thus; *R.B.* is a Papiſt: But he ſhould have liberty: Therefore Papiſts ſhould have liberty. But yet this is not that I aim at: But that he ſhould place Popery in a thing which the Church hath uſed for ſo many hundred years, even as high as any Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory or Writing can give us light, is not this the way to make all turn Papiſts, and ſay, Hath Chriſt had no Church but Papiſts ſo long? then we will be Papiſts too: For ſure the Head had ſtill a Body. Well, when God will heal his Churches diviſions, he will teach men moderation.

---

§. 5.

THe next aſſault I meet with, is *pag.* 50, 51. §. 5. *Some of our late Divines (who ſeem to diſclaim the doctrine of the Papiſts and Arminians) ſay the very ſame; who explain themſelves to this effect. That faith doth Juſtifie as a Condition, or Antecedent qualification, by which we are made capable of being Juſtified, according to the order and Conſtitution of God: The fulfilling of which Condition ſay they is our Evangelical Righteouſneſs, whereby we are Juſtified in the ſight of God. Mr.* Baxter *is ſo fond of this notion, that although in one place he finds fault with the length of our Creeds and Confeſſions, yet he would have this made an Article of the Creed, a part of our Childrens Catechiſms, and to be believed by every man that is a Chriſtian, ſo apt are we to ſmile upon our own babes.*

Rep. More of the old language ſtill: 1. Is this *the very ſame* as the Papiſts and Arminians hold, which you ſay it is the *very ſame* with, viz. *That God for Chriſts ſake accounts our imperfect faith, to be perfect Righteouſneſs? You know* they *take not* perfect Righteouſneſs *for Righteouſneſs only that hath a formal Metaphyſical perfection of Entity as I do. You ſay* Their opinion is, that God in the Covenant of Grace requires faith, which in his gracious Acceptation ſtands in ſtead of that obedience to the Moral Law which we ought to perform. *But I ſay that Chriſts ſatisfaction is inſtead of that obedience, in that it is inſtead of our ſuffering for diſobedience. You credit the Papiſts and Arminians ſtill, if you can prove that their opinion is the very ſame with this. Do they renounce Merit? and do not our Divines generally make that the point of our difference about Juſtification by Works?* viz. *Whether the merit of Good Works Juſtifie? which I heartily and conſtantly deny.*

2. I have told you before, that I ſay, that we are no otherwiſe Juſtified by the Evangelical Righteouſneſs in queſtion, then in neceſſary ſubordination to Chriſts own Righteouſneſs, as the Condition of our Legal title to it, of his own appointing. This you conceal.

3. It is another fiction, that it is this *Notion* that I would have an Article of the Creed (if you mean the *Notiones ſecundæ*, yea or the *primæ* directly.) For I told you that I ſpoke of the Matter and not the phraſe: It is the ſubſtance of the doctrine, *viz.* That we muſt *believe* our ſelves, and not think

we may be excuſed, as having a Saviour that hath believed in himſelf for us.

4. For my part as I am confident it is implied in the Creed, ſo it ſhall be my Creed while I breath, by the grace of God. And I think Chriſt put it into the Creed if ever he made a Creed: ſure it is the ſumm or principal heads of the Goſpel which he ſent his Diſciples to preach to the world, and I think that is part of the Creed: and what that was is evident, *Mar.* 16.16. *He that Believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved, and he that believeth not ſhall be damned.* And it was the Creed that was taught them before baptiſm: and that was, *Repent and believe for remiſſion of ſins.*

You add, *Though I honor Mr.* Baxter *for his excellent parts, yet I muſt ſuſpend my Aſſent to his new Creed.*

Rep. 1. No newer then the Scripture, nay elder then Scripture, for it is as old as the Covenant of Grace. 2. I had rather be without your Honor, then you ſhould be without the Truth: not that I much care whether you be of my opinion, as ſuch; but that I care for your ſalvation. But my hope is, that though you take not faith to be a Condition of Salvation, yet you do Believe on other Grounds; and if you have that which is the condition, I doubt not but you may be ſaved, though you know it not to be the condition: And if you think you may not Endeavor for ſalvation, yet if you *do endeavor it*, and *act for it* while you ſay the contrary that it may not be done, I doubt not of your ſafety, becauſe you hold that Practically which you deny ſpeculatively. But I muſt tell you, that he that thinks, though but ſpeculatively, that he *ought not to do it*, is in great danger of being drawn to omit it.

You proceed, *I ſhall prove anon that faith is not ſaid to Juſtifie as an Antecedent Condition, which qualifies us for Juſtification: but at preſent I ſhall only render him the reaſons of my diſbelief, why I cannot look upon faith as that Evangelical Righteouſneſs, by which we are Juſtified. I ſhall not inſiſt upon it, though it be not altogether unconſiderable, that this notion is Guilty of too much confederacy with the forenamed enemies of the Chriſtian faith: For though it is no good argument to ſay, that Papiſts, Socinians,* &c. *do hold this or that, therefore it is not true; yet it will follow that ſuch and ſuch Tenets have been held by Papiſts,* &c. *and unanimouſly oppoſed by our Proteſtant writers; therefore they ought to be the more ſuſpected, and eſpecially ſuch tenets of theirs, as have been the chief points in difference between us and them, as this is.*

Rep. 1. I ſhall as readily ſuſpect ſuch points as bear your deſcription, as you. 2. It is untrue that this is ſuch, *quoad terminos*, much more *quoad ſenſum.* All our Divines maintain an Inherent Righteouſneſs, and in the ſame ſenſe as they (ſo far as I underſtand them of chief note) do deny them to juſtifie us, I deny it too.

You add, *Our Brethren that have ſtarted this Notion, do take faith as the others do, in a proper ſenſe, they attribute as much to the* τὸ credere, *as* Bellarmine, Arminius, *or any other. Faith it ſelf (ſaith Mr.* B.*) is our Righteouſneſs: There was never any Papiſt ſo abſurd as to ſay, that our Faith, Love,* &c. *are perfect legal Righteouſneſs; but that God* judicio miſericordiæ, non juſtitiæ, *doth account and accept of it inſtead of perfect righteouſneſs. For my part I muſt confeſs that I can ſee no difference between them but in expreſſions. The Papiſts do acknowledge the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, and that he is the meritorious Cauſe of our Juſtification. They ſay indeed that we are not Juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt Imputed, but by a Righteouſneſs inherent in us, or righ-*

righteous actions performed by us. And what do our Brethren say less then this? But I shall follow this parallel no further.

Rep. 1. What do they say less then this, who maintain Imputed Righteousness, *viz.* less then those that deny it? I'le put another question upon this of yours: Whether a Question can be false? A Logician will say, It cannot be false; and yet a Divine will say, It may be *mendacium*; and yet both say true: Is not that strange! 2. I desire the Reader to excuse me from the trouble of enumerating all the untruths in these lines (for I am aweary of that work, and its to little profit,) and to expect my full satisfaction to this Parallel, in my Reply to Mr. *Crandon* (if God will,) where I shall shew him whether I be a Papist or an Arminian; and whether his tongue and his brothers be any slander.

You proceed §. 6. *The Reasons which turn the scales of my judgement against this Notion, that our faith or faithful actions, are that Evangelicall Righteousness, by which we are justified, Are.*

Rep. Before I weigh your Reasons, I will do the Reader that favour which you deny him, *viz.* To let him know a little better the state of the Question, and what it is that I maintain.

Understand therefore Reader, that I hold these conclusions (which I shall fullier open, God willing, in Reply to Mr. *Crandon.*) 1. That Gods universal Law of Nature requireth of us perfect Obedience, on Pain of eternall death if we perform it not. 2. We all sinned, and so were liable to that Death. 3. Christ became the Mediator, and stept between us and the ful execution, and took the penalty upon himself, and became a sacrifice to offended Justice, and a Ransom for the sinners. 4. Upon this he acquired *Novum Jus Dominii & Novum Jus Imperii* over all men; being now the Soveraign of the world as Redeemer, as superadded to the former Dominion and Soveraignty which the Father, Son and holy Ghost had as Creator. 5. As Christ the Anointed and Soveraign Redeemer, he made *Legem Remedialem*, An Act of Oblivion, A new Law, *viz.* A Law of Grace; thereby granting free pardon, Justification, Adoption, and right to Glory to all that will sincerely Repent and Believe in him; and Peremptorily Concluding those to everlasting death that will not. 6. This Repenting and Believing is nothing but Assenting so heartily to the Truth of the Gospel, as thereupon to accept the Lord Jesus Christ and life in him, as he is offered, *viz.* As a pardoner by Grateful Consent and Confidence, as Good to us, by Love; as Soveraign, by giving up our selves to him for guidance, and to take him for the Physitian of our souls, to rest on him, and apply his sharpest plaisters, and take his bitterest medicines, and which are most ungrateful to flesh and blood (and not to believe that the cure is done already:) and, as a *free gift* we must accept this Grace, with confession of our own utter undeserving, and our desert of eternal wrath, and therefore with *Repentance* to the glory of him that *freely* saveth us: and lastly, as he is the Purchaser, Giver, and Conductor to the *unseen* everlasting glory, which is the great End for which we do receive him; without respect to which End, faith were no saving faith. 6. Remission and Justification by Christs Satisfaction and Merit, being given us by a New Law, which hath its Precepts and Penalty, we are obliged by this Law to perform these Conditions, and shall be judged by this Law, whether we have performed them or no. In which judgment, he that is accused not to have performed them, *i.e.* to be an unbeliever and rebel against the Lord Redeemer, must plead his own actual performance, and deny the accusation. And therefore that performance is the *Justitia Causæ*, the righteousness of

that

that his cauſe, and of his perſon ſo far. 7. In reſpect to this perſonal New Covenant righteouſneſs, the Scripture doth twenty times, if not twenty more, call men righteous: yea even in the deſcription of the Iudgement, *Mat.* 25. laſt. 8. As this new Law is but *Lex particularis Remedians*, properly ſubordinate to the Law of Nature, ſo this perſonal righteouſneſs, is not our *Juſtitia univerſalis*, but a particular righteouſneſs, ſubordinate to the righteouſneſs of the Lord Ieſus. 9. There being therefore a twofold Iuſtification or righteouſneſs, principal and ſubordinate, one which anſwers the Law of nature, the other which anſwers the falſe charge of not performing the condition of the Law of Grace; one in Chriſts Satisfaction and Merit, the other in our faith and repentance; one conſiſting in the Pardon of all our ſin and the right to Impunity and the Kingdom, the other in our having the true condition of pardon and right; It follows, that when the queſtion is of Juſtification in the firſt ſenſe, and of the matter (as we call it) of that Iuſtification, *i. e.* the thing for which we are juſtified meritoriouſly, that we muſt then conclude that it is onely Chriſts righteouſneſs that is our Iuſtification or our righteouſneſs; and that faith or repentance is not the leaſt part of it: But if the Queſtion be only of the meer ſubordinate righteouſneſs and Iuſtification, then we muſt ſay that our own faith and repentance, & not Chriſts ſatisfaction is that righteouſneſs: For it is a debaſing of Chriſts righteouſneſs, to bring it ſo low; and it is no other exalting of faith then God hath in his Covenant exalted it, to raiſe it ſo high, as to be thus ſubordinate to Chriſts righteouſneſs, that it may become ours. 10. In regard of the firſt great Iuſtification of a ſinner, conſiſting in remiſſion of ſin (*conſtitutive*) and ſentential abſolving him from guilt, Faith or any work of mans is but the condition *ſine qua non*, and not the leaſt part of that righteouſneſs (as is ſaid.) But in regard of that ſubordinate Iuſtification which is but a means to the former, faith and repentance are our righteouſneſs it ſelf, ſo that faith is firſt in order of nature but a condition; but ſecondarily, when the caſe at Iudgements, Whether we have performed that condition or not, then conſequentially it is our ſubordinate particular Righteouſneſs. 11. No man can perform this condition without Gods ſpecial grace. 12. It was the intent and abſolute Will, yea and undertaking of Chriſt dying, to cauſe all the Elect of God infallibly to perform this condition. Thus Reader I have anticipated ſome part of what I intended to ſay in my Anſwer to Mr. *Crandon*, as being unwilling to delay thy information, or be guilty of the continuance of thy prejudice againſt the truth. I confeſs I have lately received Animadverſions from Learned men, againſt the thing here laid down, *viz* a perſonal Righteouſneſs; but Gods Word is ſo plain, and mens reaſons againſt it in my eyes ſo weak, that I am more then ever confirmed in it. I equally hate vain diſtinction and confuſion: But to diſtinguiſh between the Law of nature & the Law of grace, between Chriſts Righteouſneſs imputed, and the condition of Imputation, and ſo between our primary Righteouſneſs & our ſubordinate Righteouſneſs, I think are no vain diſtinctions. Let's make it plain by a ſimilitude. In a time of Rebellion, upon the Princes interceſſion and ſatisfaction, An Act of grace is granted, that whoever will acknowledge the Princes favour and the Kings, and Accept a pardon, ſhall be forgiven, and ſhall not die. Is it not one thing here to accuſe a man as a Traytor, and another thing to accuſe him of not accepting the pardon? and are not theſe two cauſes referring to two Laws? yet one ſubordinate to the other, and not coordinate. When he is accuſed of Treaſon, he is juſtified by the Act of Grace: and this is I is *Titulus ad Liberationem*. But

when

when it is but one Traytor of many that accepteth the Act of Grace, and he is accused of *non*-acceptance, and the case to be decided falls to be this. Whether the Act of Grace give that man any Right to Impunity? then because it was a conditional Act, he must be here justified by pleading that he did perform the condition. And so that justification which is but subordinate, and in order of dignity but secondary, as a means to the former, is yet in order of Plea at Judgement to go before it, as the means must be before the end.

If thou be unprejudiced, Reader, and lovest the truth, I should think that I need not say much to Mr. *Eyres* Arguments, having given thee in these Conclusions, so clear a ground of answering them all; But I shall briefly take an account of them, and so return to Mr. *Eyre*: Who thus begins.

1. *If we are not justified by our own works, then our believing, &c. is not that Evangelical righteousness by which we are justified*: *But we are not Justified by our own works: Therefore.*

Rep. Distinguish of works, and distinguish of justifying. 1. That Justification which consisteth in Remission of sin, is not in our own faith; but that which consisteth in performing the condition of Remission is. 2. Works are taken either as *Paul* doth (which he describeth *Rom.* 4. 4. *which make the Reward to be not of grace but of debt*: Or as *James* doth, in necessary subordination to Christ. In the former sense I deny your consequence; In the later sense I deny your *minor* or Antecedent. And if you say that *Paul* supposeth that all works do make the reward to be of debt; I answer, 1. Then *James* saith we are justified by impossibility, or by unlawfull ways. The works that *James* mentions are possible and lawfull: works that make the reward to be of debt are impossible, and the attempt of such unlawfull: Therefore there are some works which do not make the reward to be of debt. 2. The same *Paul* that saith we are justified by Christ, saith oft enough that we are justified by faith, and that faith is and shall be imputed to us for Righteousness.

2. *Paul* takes works for Meritorious actions deserving wages. Faith is no such work; therefore on that ground still I deny your consequence.

3. You must distinguish of the word [*by*] when you say, We are, or are not justified *by* faith. Its one thing to be justified *by* faith, as the matter of our Righteousness. So we deny it, as to our great principal Justification. And its another thing to be justified *by* faith as a meerly subordinate condition *sine qua non*: and so *Paul* still includeth it as plain as a man can speak. Still saying, We are justified by faith. This answers fully the Texts cited by you: and is another answer then that of the Papists to which you here Reply. Yet to your answers to the last, (that *Others say, It is not works of the Law, but Gospel.*) I must give you these brief Notes (supposing that the words you answer are none of mine till better explained, limited and reformed.)

To your first, I say, *distinguit Lex. Paul* and *James* else will hardly be reconciled. Yea *Paul* himself distinguisheth, by punctual expressing the works of the Law, or telling you he means only works that make *the reward to be not of grace but of debt*; and taking in faith as that by which we are justified.

To your second, you speak very darkly and dangerously: and against you I return. If *Paul* exclude all Debt which follows upon promise, then he excludes all that follows upon an absolute promise, as well as upon a conditional: But the Consequent is false, therefore so is the Antecedent. The reason of the Consequence is clear. Either you mean that this is *from the promise, as a promise*, or

elſe *from the promiſe as conditional.* If the former, then it follows an abſolute promiſe as much as a conditional; and then you muſt deny all Gods promiſes, and then you will be againſt the Goſpel indeed. If the later, then I ſay, That the promiſe *qua* conditional, gives no right; diſtinguiſh of conditions: Some are of ſuch value as to be Meritorious: theſe cauſe the debt by Merit: Others have no meriting value (as the acceptance of a free gift:) theſe are no cauſes ſo much as Moral, but meer conditions. And whoever knows what a condition in Law-ſenſe is, knows that as ſuch, it only ſuſpends the act of a Teſtament or other gift, till it be performed, but doth not cauſe it, when it is performed.

To your third, it is anſwered already.

To your fourth, ſee my anſwer to Mr *Blake*. Alſo, The Goſpel is a ſubordinate Law, and the matter of its precept is taken out of the general Law of nature: but informed with a new promiſe. *Adams* body was earth; but yet to be diſtinguiſhed from common earth, and worthy of another name, when it was informed with a new from, even his ſoul. I doubt you will not apprehend well what theſe ſhort expreſſions contain, unleſs you will pleaſe to conſider and digeſt them.

To your fifth *Paulus Burgenſis*, a Chriſtian Iew, on *Jam. add. ad* Lyrani *Annot.* tels us that his Countreymens opinion was, that God denominated a man righteous or wicked according to the greater part of his works. If he had more good works then bad, he was righteous: elſe not. The Iews did not think to be juſtified by perfect unſinning obedience: for they were to confeſs ſin, and ſacrifice for it. But they thought that their ſacrifices themſelves and their good works might ſo procure the pardon of their ſins, or prevail againſt their evil works, that they looked not for Righteouſneſs to Chriſt the end of the Law. This is the juſtification by works which *Paul* argues againſt directly; and only conſequentially *à fortiore* we may gather it, as of perfect obedience, which is to us impoſſible, as it may be ſuppoſed to juſtifie us from the charge *of being ſinners*. Yet becauſe their obedience was not perfect, *Paul* might well convince them that it could not juſtifie when they erred in thinking, that imperfect obedience, by the help of ſacrifices, might juſtifie.

2. Your ſecond Argument is this, 2. *If the righteouſneſs whereby we are Juſtified be a perfect Righteouſneſs, then we are not Juſtified by our obedience to Goſpel-precepts: But,* &c, *Therefore.*

This is anſwered in the former, by the ſame diſtinctions. The righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified as *by the Matter, or Meritorious cauſe*, is perfect: and therefore faith or obedience is not ſuch. But the righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified as a meer condition, and conſequentially a righteouſneſs ſubordinate to the former, is not perfect; and therefore of this your conſequence fails. All your following words therefore to this, are meerly beſide the Point, and vain. I never doubted of that, Whether any imperfect thing can be our univerſal grand righteouſneſs? no doubt it cannot: But you ſhould prove that it cannot be a ſubordinate conditional particular Righteouſneſs.

You do here confeſs that our Proteſtant Divines do call inherent Holineſs, Evangelical righteouſneſs: Very good: I deſire no more then thoſe words contain: Yet I pray you confeſs that the Scripture commonly cals it ſo before them. I Certainly *juſtum fieri & juſtificari*, as to conſtitutive juſtification is all one. He therefore that is righteous is doubtleſs juſtified *conſtitutivè*. And doubtleſs to be ſentenced juſt, and to be juſtified by ſentence, is all one. And he that is firſt juſt by conſtitution, muſt needs be juſtified by ſentence. But then all this is but *in tantum*:

ſo

ſo far as he is juſt, ſo far he is undoubtedly *juſtificatus conſtitutivè, & juſtificandus per ſententiam*; and (as I ſaid before) is it not as ſtrange a righteouſneſs which makes not a man righteous *in tantum*, (I ſpeak of a formal Making) as a Whiteneſs that makes not white, or a *Paternitas* that makes not *Patrem*? 2. Do not all men know that (as Mr. *Bradſhaw* ſaith) a very Reprobate may have ſome particular righteouſneſs? If you accuſe *Judas* of killing the man that was ſlain yeſterday, he is righteous as to this cauſe. Why then ſhould you think the name of Righteouſneſs ſo intollerable, when applied to faith and obedience.

O but (ſaith a Learned man to me) then you aſcribe but ſuch a kind of righteouſneſs to faith and obedience, as a Reprobate may have: that's a fair advancement to faith. *Anſ.* 1. Methinks then you ſhould not ſay I am a Papiſt, and give too much to faith? 2. But conſider, though both may have a *juſtitiam particularem*, yet to one it is in a caſe of no advantage to him: but in the other it is a condition of his eternal felicity, and ſo made by the Law of God. When ſalvation lies on one as a condition, and not on the other, I think there is much difference.

Now to your third Argument, where you ſay, *If the righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified, be the righteouſneſs of God, then we are not juſtified by our obedience to Goſpel-precepts: But*, &c. *Therefore.*

Rep. All is of Gods gift. But in your ſenſe I ſay, Our ſubordinate particular conditional Righteouſneſs, is not the Righteouſneſs performed by God without us: The word [*by*] therefore, and [*Juſtified*] and [*Righteouſneſs*] muſt be diſtinguiſhed as before. All the reſt of your words on this need no other anſwer, and I deſire not to tire the Reader. The righteouſneſs mentioned *Mat.* 25. was perſonal: ſo was that which *James* ſpeaks of when he ſaith, *We are Juſtified by works:* and that which *John* mentions, when he ſaith, *He that doth Righteouſneſs is Righteous*, and fourty more.

Your fourth Argument is this, *If we are not Juſtified by two righteouſneſſes, exiſting in two diſtinct ſubjects, then our obedience to Goſpel-precepts is not that righteouſneſs whereby we are Juſtified: But*, &c. *Therefore.*

Rep. 1. To the Antecedent I ſay, of two coordinate righteouſneſſes it is true; but of two, whereof one is coordinate and the other ſubordinate, it is falſe, that there is not two. 2. But formally they are both in one ſubject: for it is We that are Righteous by Chriſts Righteouſneſs: that is, by that which is Chriſts materially, and in another numerical form; for ſurely one accident is not in two ſubjects. But I ſay, materially one is in Chriſt, and the other in us.

And here I remember an odd paſſage that you have, *pag.* 7. which I ſhall recite. *It doth not follow that Chriſts Righteouſneſs cannot be imputed to us, before we have an actual created being, becauſe Accidents cannot ſubſiſt without their ſubjects: for as much as imputed righteouſneſs is not an accident inherent in us, and conſequently doth not neceſſarily require our exiſtence. Chriſt is the ſubject of this Righteouſneſs, and the imputation of it as an act of God.*

Rep. Hear all you that have been ſeduced by Mr. *Eyre* to believe that man was juſtified before he was born: Here he explaineth his mind to you. He ſaid [*man*] but he meant [*Chriſt.*] If it be not we but Chriſt that is the ſubject, then doubtleſs it is not *we* but *Chriſt* that hath the accident, and that is to be denominated by it: And then it is Chriſt that was righteous before we were born, and not we. Or elſe Chriſt makes us righteous, and yet we are not righteous, or we are righteous and not righteous at once (even when we are not men) and that in reſpect of the ſame righteouſneſs. When I read ſuch paſſages as theſe, I underſtand the

meaning of your Patrons, that wonder men ſhould ſeek to bring Gods Truths down to the reaſon of man: *i.e.* we muſt become bruits that we may become Chriſtians (a horrid thing to ſpeak;) and we muſt put out the eye of reaſon, that we may ſee with faith, which is the only ſupernatural elevation of reaſon.

But you have an Argument *pag.* 57. to prove the aſſumption of your laſt *viz.* *If by Chriſts Righteouſneſs alone we are made perfectly Juſt and Righteous in the ſight of God, then there is no other Rightcouſneſs which concurrs with his to our Juſtification: For what needs an addition to that which is perfect? But,* &c. *Therefore.* All is granted, if you ſpeak of the matter or form of our principal Righteouſneſs; The Addition of a Condition is through no defect or imperfection in it:- but God hath made it neceſſary to our participation of that which was not done by our ſelves, but by another. It is not true that we are made righteous by Chriſts Righteouſneſs, till the condition be performed: but when it is performed, we are juſtified perfectly by Chriſts Righteouſneſs alone, as to the principal general Juſtification; the condition performed being but a ſubſervient particular righteouſneſs. I would you would well conſider, that Chriſt died to pardon nothing but our ſins, and that he that hath nothing but ſin, is not pardoned.

You add, *If we be Juſtified partly by Chriſts Righteouſneſs, and partly by our own, then our faith for Juſtification muſt rely partly upon Chriſts Rightcouſneſs, and partly upon our ſelves: But,* &c. *Therefore.*

Rep. I deny the Conſequence. It is the relying on Chriſt that is our ſubordinate righteouſneſs it ſelf: and therefore is ſuch, becauſe it is made the condition of our part in Chriſt: They are not coordinate, nor is faith our principal Righteouſneſs, but of a lower ſort. God hath ſaid, that if by faith we receive Chriſt, we ſhall be juſtified, and our faith ſhall be imputed to us for righteonſneſs: but he hath never ſaid, If we will reſt on our own faith, we ſhall be righteous: For then reſting on that faith would be a third ſort of righteouſneſs, ſubordinate to faith it ſelf. Theſe be but raw fancies.

Your fifth Argument is, *That which overthrows the main difference between the Law and the Goſpel, ought not to be admitted: for the confounding them will open an inlet to innumerable errors; nay by this means the Goſpel it ſelf will become a meer Cypher,* &c. *But the making our obedience to Goſpel-Precepts the Rightcouſneſs whereby we are Juſtified, overthrows the main difference between the Law and the Goſpel: Therefore. For herein ſtands the chief agreement and difference between the Law and Goſpel: They agree in this, That to Juſtification both do require the perfect fulfilling of the Law: But herein they differ, That the Law requireth to Juſtification, a Righteouſneſs inherent in us, and perfect obedience to be performed in our own perſons: The Goſpel reveals for our Juſtification the perfect righteouſneſs of another, even of Chriſt, which is accepted in their behalf that do believe in him,* &c.

Rep. Theſe words which you cite out of Biſhop *Downham*, ſay as I ſay in full ſenſe; and ſay nothing to confirm your *minor*, which I deny, if you ſpeak but of a ſubordinate particular righteouſneſs; elſe I grant all. Do I ſay that we are juſtified by perfect obedience, which *Downham* ſpeaks of? yea or by any in coordination with Chriſt? If you underſtood the difference your ſelf between the Law and Goſpel, you would correct all theſe errors, and be a wiſer man then I think either you or I are now. I pray you do me the favor as to conſult but Mr. *Pemble* of juſtification, in the place cited even now (ſeeing you ſuppoſe him to be your

own,

own, but it ſeems diſclaimed you a little before he went to heaven) and ſee how he differenceth the Law and the Goſpel.

You ſay, *A defect in degrees is a ſin againſt the Goſpel*, &c.

Rep. It is not a *non*-performance of the Goſpel condition, and then it is no hinderance to our Juſtification by it. Some Learned men have much boaſted of that Argument [*Obedience is it ſelf imperfect, and therefore cannot be the condition of our Juſtification (as conſummate at Judgement, or continued) for then what ſhall pardon the defects of it.*] As if imperfect obedience might not be the condition of the pardon of its own imperfections (ſubordinate to faith, as is ſaid:) May not an imperfect faith be the condition of the pardon of its own imperfections?

But to Mr. *Eyre*, who having done with me, adds. *Now briefly my ſenſe of this Propoſition*, [We are juſtified by faith] *is no other then that which hath been given by all our Ancient Proteſtant Divines, who take faith herein objectively, not properly*, &c.

Rep. Our Divines take faith objectively, when the matter of our righteouſneſs is ſpoken of; but how? Only by connotation of the object; and not by excluſion of faith it ſelf: as if the word [*Faith*] ſignified Chriſt. Elſe you would faſten a ſtrange ſenſe on *Paul*, when it is ſaid [*If we believe it ſhall be imputed to us alſo*,] doth the word [*Believe*] ſtand for the word [*Chriſt*?] But this our Divines have ſo fully confuted, that I will ſay no more to it but this, That if by [*Believing*] be not meant [*Believing*] but [*Chriſt*], when it is ſo many and many times rehearſed, 1. Scripture is made the moſt uſeleſs unintelligible writing in the World, when no man can know the ſenſe by the words a hundred times repeated. For your ſaying that *Paul* by *Faith* means not *Faith*, is no evidence to convince me. O how glad are the Papiſts of ſuch expoſitions as yours, that may convince men that none can underſtand the Scripture without a Judge of its ſenſe. 2. And then, why might it not as well be ſaid that a man is juſtified by ſeeing Chriſt, or hearing him, or hearing of him, or any other act, as well as Believing, if it be not Believing that is meant, where it is ſpoken? But I will not anticipate Mr. *Woodbridge* in his work.

---

§ 6.

THe next aſſault that I meet with is *pag.* 90, 91. where you ſay, *Mr.* B. (Theſ. 70.) *includes all works of obedience to Evangelical Precepts in the definition of faith, in which ſenſe I preſume no Papiſt will deny that we are Juſtified by faith alone, taking it as he doth, for* fides formata, *or faith animated with charity and other good works.*

Rep. Here is at leaſt one untruth expreſſed, and another implied. 1. There is no mention in thoſe words of mine of obedience to all Evangelical Precepts: but only of that ſincere obedience which is made by God the condition of ſalvation. Now obedience may be ſincere, and yet not be to all Precepts which are in the Goſpel: Many a leſſer particular duty may be unknown to one that obeys ſincerely: Mr. *Eyre* is bound by the Goſpel to believe that faith goes before Juſtification, and yet he knows not this; may he not for all that obey ſincerely? The Goſpel requireth Baptiſm, and I think of Infants; yet it will not follow that no man is ſincerely obedient that is unbaptized, as miſtaking it to be now no duty, or that is againſt Infant-Baptiſm, on the like miſtake.

2. You intimate that it is our first justifying faith, or faith strictly taken that I here describe; and so add your parallel of the Papists. But honesty required you to have confessed on the contrary, that I had before spoke of faith in the proper strict sense, as it is the condition upon which every man receiveth the Remission of all the sins past of his whole life, and that Justification *quoad statum*, which some call Universal Justification, as distinct from particular Justification and Remission following upon every new sin: and that in the words which you cite I only described faith in a more large improper sense, and as it is the condition only of our glorification, and final Justification in the great Judgement. Why should you conceal this, and imply the contrary?

---

§. 7.

THe next touch that I find is *pag.* 94. where you tell Mr. *W.* 2. *If faith were a condition morally disposing us for Justification, we should then be concurrent causes with the Merits of Christ in procuring our Justification: for the Merits of Christ are not a Physical but a Moral cause, which obtain their effect by vertue of that Covenant which was made between him and the Father: now by ascribing unto faith a Moral Causal influx in our Justification, we do clearly put it* in eodem genere causæ *with the blood of Christ: which I hope Mr.* W. *will better consider of, before he engage too far in Mr.* Baxters *cause.*

Rep. Because you are pleased to make it my cause, I will be bold to give my Reply. There are very palpable errors delivered with confidence in these words.

1. You confound moral *Disposing*, and moral *Causing*: All *disposing* is not *causing*.

2. You most falsly suppose that we ascribe to faith *A moral causal influx in Justification*: and do nothing to prove it.

3. All is grounded on that gross Error, That *all Civil or Legal conditions, are Moral Causes*, which is so far from truth, that the clean contrary is true. *No Civil or Legal condition*, qua talis, *is a Moral cause.* 1. A condition only while unperformed, suspendeth the act of the Law or Testament, that is, It was the Will of the Legislator or Testator, or Donor, that his Law, Testament, &c. should act, or effect when the condition is performed, and not before: but not that it should be any cause: no more then *quando venit dies* the time is a cause. 2. A condition is but *causa sine qua non*; therefore it is no moral cause. Yet its true that among men, most conditions in another respect are moral causes; but none of them, *as conditions.* Men use to make somewhat a condition (though not alway) which is of worth to themselves, and so hath somewhat in the nature of the thing which is meritorious (when the condition is not casual, but Potestative or mixt:) and this is a Moral cause, not as it is a condition, but as meritorious. Would you have the world believe, without better manifestation, that you are so excellent a Lawyer, that we must take your word against common sense, and the common judgement of men that should be wiser in their own profession? You know sure that its common in the Civil Law to have cases of such casual conditions, as cannot be causal? As *if such a Ship come into such a Harbour, such a day*, being nothing to the Donors advantage. *If such a son live to such an age, he shall have such Lands. If the Arrow that is shot up, fall within such a space.* And the like is true in Potestative conditions (as they call them) that is, voluntary: *I give thee a pardon on condition thou wilt accept it: or not refuse it: or not ungratefully*

gratefully abuse me when I have given it thee: not spit in my face: not seek my life, ruine, dishonor, &c. None of these are Meritorious, and therefore none of them causal.

4. Have you never observed that your friend Dr. *Twiss* doth not once or twice, but ordinarily, affirm that faith is a condition and *medium* of our justification, and that good works are *causa dispositiva*, and *præparatoria salutis?* I may tell you more of his mind hereafter.

One thing more in this Section I desire your resolution of. You here say, that *the Merits of Christ are not a Physical but a Moral cause*: upon which I would know; 1. Do not you take as much from it as I, and make the Merits of Christ as much a *causa sine qua non in sensu physico*, as I? For what can you do more then say it is no Physical cause at all? And with what justice or modesty then could you before pretend that I am worse in this very point then the Papists themselves, when I am no worse then you? A Moral causality I allow it, as well as you.

Nay secondly give me leave to enquire whether in deed and truth you do allow it a Moral causality of our justification at all; In your *page 66.* you answer a shrewd Objection, which would prove you near to infidelity, *viz. That you make void the Death of Christ: for if Justification be an immanent act in God, it is antecedent not only to faith, but to the Merits of Christ, which is contrary to many Scriptures, that do ascribe our Justification to his blood, as to a Meritorious cause.* To which you Answer, *That although Gods Will not to punish be antecedent to the death of Christ; yet for all we may be said to be Justified in him, because the whole effect of that Will is by and for the sake of Christ. As though Electing love precede the consideration of Christ,* 1oh. 3. 16. *yet are we said to be chosen in him,* Eph. 2. 4. *because all the Effects of that Love, are given by, and through, and for him. Gods* not punishing *us, is the fruits of his death: yet his Will not to punish, is antecedent thereunto.*

Rep. This distinction of *Actus volentis*, and *res volita*, we have oft here on such occasions. But 1. Do not you here make our active justification to be no fruit of Christs Merits at all, but only our passive? Now if you would publish this doctrine nakedly, That *Justificatio Justificans*, or Gods active Iustification, is not at all procured by Christ, it would be more candid and open dealing, then you use while you pretend so much to exalt Christs Merit, in your denying the parts or interest of faith and obedience.

2. Surely then we must find out another Active Iustification, whereof Christs Merits are the cause, as well as of the passive, if we will be ruled by Scripture; and this your Brethren have done, for which you oppose them.

3. I would commend it to your consideration, Whether it be not a work worth your labour, the next time you set upon these imployments, to open to us like a Philosopher and Divine, how and in what sense and respect it is, that the Merits of Christ can cause the effect and not the act? the *rem Volitam*, and not the *actum Volendi*? And how Christs Merits can be a moral cause, or a meriting cause, and yet not cause the act of God? Merit you know is reckoned among the remote efficients of our pardon, and sanctification, and salvation. Now if God be the nearer efficient, how can Merit which is the remote, cause these effects, and not cause Gods act? I would intreat you to answer it, as to all these effects, even Sanctification, and Glorification, as well as pardon. You know also, I suppose, that Merit

is

is accounted one of the Procatarctical less-principal efficients; Now the nature of this cause is to incite the principal cause *ad agendum* extrinsically. And Merit is said to be that which moveth the agent *ad talionem reddendam*. Now if Christs Merits move not God as a Procatarctical cause, then how are they truly meritorious causes? You know also, I doubt not, that a *moral causing* in such cases as ours about voluntarily Agents, doth consist in an argumentative, objective, or the like moral moving of the Agent. Now how can Christs Merits be moral causes here, and work nothing upon God the principal Cause? when this moral cause is a remote cause, and a remote cause produceth the effect *mediâ causa propinquiore*? I do not hereby conclude my self that Gods Will was moved by Christs Merits; but there is another wedge then yours by which we must cleave this knotty block; which if I tell you of, its like you will be prejudiced against it, because it is from me; but if you will study to expedite the business your self a little better then here you have done, it may reduce you to a better mind in the main. But if it should prove upon these considerations, that you do contradict your self, and do indeed deny Christ to be any cause, so much as Moral and Meritorious of justification active or passive, of the *Actus volentis* or *Res volita*, then I think you have been an unhappy exalter of Christ, while your zeal carried you against the Interest of faith.

And methinks it should be scarce savoury to a friend of Christ and an exalter of his Merits, to have them made no more a cause of our justification, then of our Election; that is, of the effects of both which are in time, but of neither of themselves which are from eternity.

And I take it but for private Theology, that *all the effects of electing love are given by, through and for Christ*. Whereby you plainly intimate him to be the *meritorious* cause of the *effects*, which you deny of the *Act*. But 1. the giving of Christ himself is no small effect of electing love, and yet not given for and through himself. Christ was not given to Merit, for the sake of his Merit, as any efficient cause. 2. *Adam* and the Creation I think were not made upon the procurement of Christs Merits. 3. Nor was man endowed then with the Image of God. 4. Nor made Lord of the Inferiour Creatures. 5 Nor placed in a Paradise. 6. Nor had the promise of immortality and felicity, if he sinned not; upon the procurement of the Merits of Christ. Yet all these were effects of electing love, being all means for the attainment of the ends of election. But many such things as these your Reader must bear with you in, unless he be a less scrupulous man, that can swallow all.

---

§. 8.

THe next place that I find my self snapt at is *pag* 101 where you say, *He gives us a youthfull frolike to shew his gallantry, like Mr.* Baxters *challenge*, [Let the Antinomians shew one Scripture which speaks of Iustification from Eternity.] *The Antinomians, saith he* (*Mr.* W.) *the Antipapists and Anti-Arminians he means*) *may read their eyes out, before they produce us one Text, for any other Iustification in Scripture, which is not by Faith or Works.*

Rep. This requires small answer. 1. Why could not such a rude challenge as this, once provoke you to open your Bible and transcribe one Text to that sense?

Had

Had not one ſuch Text been as ſoon cited, as all this book written? But ſomething is wanting? He that cannot ſay what he ſhould, muſt ſay what he *can*, rather then yield or ſay nothing.

2. I perceive it is not onely I that am a Papiſt or Arminian with you, or with whom an Antinomian ſignifies an Antipapiſt, and an Antiarminian? Mr. *Woodbridge* fals under the ſame laſh. But, Sir, while the Harmony of Confeſſions, and the Synod of *Dort*, and the late Confeſſion of our Aſſembly are viſible, the world hath a better character to know a Papiſt and Arminian by, then yours; and will hardly be perſwaded that all are Papiſts and Arminians that hold not the eternity of Juſtification or Remiſſion, and that it is before the death and purchaſe of Chriſt, or that hold not that we are juſtified before we are men, or pardoned before we have ſinned; no nor all thoſe that hold not the Juſtification of Infidels.

But I perceive you are not ſparing of your accuſations of thoſe that are not of your party and opinion; when *pag.* 84. you do ſo let fly at his Brother Mr. *John Woodbridge* forſooth "[as no hearty friend to gathering and reforming Churches, as deſerting a Congregation in *New-England*, whereof he was Paſtor, to become a Pariſh-Parſon in the *Old*; and not onely ſo, but hath ſtood to maintain that Pariſhes are true Churches.] And you ſay, [Its like his Parſonage is better, *&c.*]

Where 1. you venture to caſt your cenſure upon the hidden thoughts of a mans heart, which is Gods prerogative: *Who art thou that judgeſt another mans ſervant?* Do you know that it was a better Parſonage that is the cauſe of what you mention? You that dare do this, dare do more. 2. If you deny that any Pariſhes, yea that many hundred Pariſhes in *England* are true Churches, you do more then judge a particular Brother, and more then you are able to make good, and more then the Brethren of *New England* would affirm. But I perceive your error is not a ſingle one, not onely in Doctrinals: Separation will not perform in the concluſion, what the leading Dividers do promiſe.

Pag. 89, 90. Though I am not named, yet perhaps concerned, I am ſure the truth is, where you ſay, "[I deſire the Reader to obſerve how much Mr. *W.* is beholden to a Popiſh Tenent, oppoſed (by all our Proteſtant Writers) to ſupport his cauſe, which is [*That faith goes before Juſtification to diſpoſe us for it.*] *Bellarmine* undertakes to prove, *&c.* Againſt whom all our Proteſtant Divines which my little Library hath obtained, do unanimouſly affirm, that faith doth not diſpoſe or prepare us for Juſtification.]

Rep. Like Cauſe, like carriage in maintaining it. 1. I ſuppoſe you know that our Divines do ſpeak it of Juſtification in the Popiſh ſenſe, which comprizeth ſanctification and faith it ſelf. But this you would not ſee or have your Reader ſee. This is but *pia fraus*. 2. I ſuppoſe you know that our Divines by [Diſpoſition and preparation] do mean by way of condition *ſine quâ non*; and ſo your Brethren teach as well as you, that faith the firſt grace, is given without any prerequiſite condition on our parts, properly ſo called; the contrary is taught by Pelagians, Jeſuites and Arminians; but your pious fraud did hide this too. Is deceiving the beſt Teaching? for error it is, but not for truth. Do you not know that the honeſt women of your Congregation that ever read Mr. *Hookers Souls preparation for Chriſt*, and *Souls effectual Vocation*, and *Souls Juſtification*, or Mr. *Jo. Rogers of Faith*, or Mr. *Bolton*, *Perkins*, or the like honeſt old Practical Divines, could quickly confute your general aſſertion, and tell you, Sir, our Library is larger then yours, for all theſe Divines do tell us of a preparation neceſſary to Juſti-

fication, yea to faith it ſelf; yea and they make this the great neceſſary doctrine for the breaking of hard hearts, and confuting the preſumptions of the prophane. It is worth the obſervation of every honeſt Chriſtian, how prophanneſs and Antinomianiſm, do run hand in hand, and ſpeak with one tongue, and put our Divines to one and the ſame labour. So that in this point of preparation for Chriſt, and many others, we muſt confute the ſame conceits of both. 3. Nay ſure you know that the generality of theſe Divines of ours, do make faith a condition, and moſt of them an inſtrument of our Juſtification: and an efficient cauſe is a little more then a paſſive preparation in *ſenſu morali*, by the act of faith.

---

§. 9.

THe next place that I finde my name in, is, *pag.* 145. (and divers other places in the margin) " [Our reconciliation is an immediate effect of the death of " Chriſt, as Mr. *Owen* hath invincibly proved in his Anſwer to *Baxter*, p. 34.] Thus you: and oft that Anſwer and Mr. *Kendall*'s is cited.

To which I ſay but this. I ſo far abhor contention, and thirſt after the Churches Peace, that I did impoſe it as a penalty on my ſelf, not to anſwer that Book of Mr. *Owens*, till I ſaw a clear call proving it my duty, becauſe I had been fooliſhly drawn to be the beginner of the Controverſie: But I would not have you therefore talk of [*Invincible proof*] of ſuch Tenets as theſe. Were that Reverend man and I to joyn Wit to Wit, and Learning to Learning, and the conteſt depended on the ſtrength of the Conteſters, I ſhould eaſily yield that he were invincible by ſuch a one as I, and that the congreſs between him and me would be as unequal, as I too haſtily ſaid it would have been between Mr. *Ball* and him. But when I ſee what an advantage the Truth yields to a weak Defendor, and conſider the diſadvantage that he hath caſt himſelf upon in that Book, I muſt profeſs to you, that I take it for as eaſie a thing to anſwer it ſufficiently, almoſt as to write ſo much paper as that Anſwer will take up. You force me by your frequent references to that Book, to ſay this much, which elſe I would not have ſaid, leaſt I ſhould exaſperate. And for Mr. *Kendall* I have told you my thoughts of his Learned Notions more at large.

---

§. 10.

THe next paſſage that toucheth me that I meet with, is *pag.* 174. where you ſay, " [A Learned man of the late Aſſembly in a Sermon before the Parliament, " then ſitting, declared, that *all* the Promiſes of the New Covenant are Abſolute, " not only *citra meritum*, but *citra conditionem*, without any prerequired conditions " of us: amongſt many other places he cites this Text (Mr. *Strong* Serm. 1 *Sam.* " 2. 30.) Beſides this I might adde abundance more: But I believe Mr. *Baxter* is " *inſtar omnium* with Mr. *W.*]

Rep. 1. I believe the plain Texts of Gods Word, not to be evaded with modeſty, is *inſtar omnium* with Mr. *Woodbridge*. He that reads his digeſted Sermon, and your acknowledgement of his ſupereminent parts, natural and acquired, will not believe that he takes his doctrine on truſt from any man, much leſs from ſuch a man as I. 2. It is great immodeſty in you, if you intend hereby to perſwade the

the world, that it is my ſingular opinion that the New Covenant hath conditions, yea or that the current of the Reformed Divines, and Churches do not expreſly contradict your conceit. For me to prove this, were as needleſs as to heap up teſtimonies to prove that the Proteſtant Divines do hold that the Scripture is Gods Word. He that is ignorant of their judgement in this, let him be ignorant ſtill for me. I except here three or four late Writers; eſpecially thoſe three *Fravequerans Maccovius*, *Cocceius* and *Cloppenburgius*. 3. But for Mr. *Strong*, I can ſay nothing, as having not his Sermon at hand; but what I have heard of the piety, Judgement & Moderation of that Learned man, and what I finde of your boldneſs in this Book in frequent untruths, I confeſs doth make me reſolve rather to believe you wrong him, till I ſhall ſee the words; though not peremptorily to conclude it and charge you with it. I have oft my ſelf maintained that the promiſe of the firſt Grace is Abſolute; but I ſhall never believe that all the promiſes of the New Covenant are Abſolute, as long as I take Gods Word for my Rule, which I hope will be till death. But here I muſt give you ſome Animadverſions on your deſcriptions of a Condition, *pag.* 184.

And to the firſt (out of Dr. *Cawell*) I ſay, that it be appointed for ſuſpending the efficacy of the act or grant, is indeed eſſential to a condition: But that it be Uncertain is meerly accidentall; Uncertain is put for Contingent, becauſe what is contingent is uſually among men uncertain; It means an uncertainty *in natura rei*, when it may tend *ad eſſe vel non eſſe*; and not that it be *actu incertum, id eſt, ignotum Donatori*. Contingent things may be certain to God; and yet contingent in themſelves ſtill: As Dr. *Twiſs* oft ſaith, He hath decreed not only that contingent things ſhall come to paſs, but *contingentia contingenter eventura*. So doth he *foreknow* that contingent things ſhall contingently come to paſs. Yet while they are contingent they are the fit matter for a condition, though he foreknow them. An unbeliever himſelf knows not that he ſhall believe. And if a man had a ſpirit of Propheſie to foreknow ſuch future events, do you think that makes him uncapable of making a conditional contract? If a Prophet had a Houſe or Land to ſet, might he not make a Legal conditional Contract, becauſe he foreknows the Rent will be paid? You may as well ſay, God ſhould make no Law, becauſe he foreknows it will be fulfilled, or men will do the thing commanded. But may he not therefore oblige them to do it? And if ſo, by a precept, I ſee not but the caſe is the ſame as to a ſanction, and condition which is eſſential to that ſanction.

And I muſt further tel you that you muſt not ſeparate what God hath conjoyned. As he foreknows that we will perform the condition, ſo he foreknows that it will be a condition by his conſtitution before we perform it. For we cannot perform a condition which is no condition. And God did not foreknow that we ſhould meerly perform the *act* of believing, but that we ſhould perform the *condition* of believing: even as he did not only foreknow that we ſhould perform the act of faith, but the duty of faith, and therefore that it muſt firſt be a duty.

Moreover I would know whether ever God threatned an elect man or not in his Law, yea or the reprobate? If not, 1. How ſaid he to *Adam, In the day thou eateſt thou ſhalt dye?* 2. Then the firſt Law had no threatning (then which nothing more falſe) or elſe *Adam* was not elect. 3. How then are unbelievers condemned already. 4. There are an hundred expreſs threatnings in the Word. 5. The contrary opinion is Antinomianiſm indeed, to take believers to be not at all threatned by the Law. 6. At leaſt are they not threatned with temporal puniſhments,

niſhments, or chaſtiſements? 7. And then wicked reprobates are not threatned, which is falſe.

If you grant the threatning to the Elect or others, then it is either a conditional threatning or Abſolute: If Abſolute then they muſt bear it: there is no eſcape; nor are all abſolute to them that muſt bear it. If conditional: then either God knows whether they will commit that ſin which is the condition of the threatning, or he doth not. The later you will diſclaim I doubt not: The former grants that there may be a condition which is yet certainly foreknown to God.

You will find the Prophet *Jeremy* making a conditional contract by Gods appointment, in a caſe wherein God had before revealed to him the event.

If (as Dr. *Twiſs* hath well proved) the ſame thing may be neceſſary and contingent, then the ſame thing may be neceſſary, foreknown, and yet conditionally given out or threatned in Law.

It is a moſt dangerous courſe of Divines to ſet Gods Decrees, Foreknowledge or Diſpoſal of Events, in oppoſition to his moral Rectorſhip, as if the acts of one muſt be inconſiſtent with the acts of the other. Let me ſpeak it out, though to the provocation of the contemptuous and ſelf-conceited, that this one grand miſtake, hath introduced moſt of their Errors, and feedeth moſt of your contentions. They cannot reconcile the acts of Gods abſolute Dominion, with the moral acts of Regiment; nor can they ſee in what a diſtinct ſeries they ſtand.

The like Anſwer ſerves to the ſame word [*incertum*] in the next definition of *Cook*. Your two later I wholly allow of, interpreting [*by performance*] to mean [*upon performance.*] Your concluſion *pag.* 185. is falſe, that *Omnis conditio antecedens eſt effectiva.* Though I remember *Chamier* hath ſuch a word, but enough to the contrary.

I have ſpoke thus much of this, that you may alſo ſee, that though the Truths in Mr. *Owens* Book are Invincible, yet the Miſtakes are not; and if you will conſider it well, I think you will find that the pulling out of this one Pin, hath cauſed his Fabrick to fall in pieces. For my part I profeſs to follow my conſcience, which upon the moſt impartial ſearch of Scripture that I am able to make, doth tell me that the Scripture doth ſo evidently contain conditional threatnings and promiſes to the Elect, that to deny it, would be, to me, to renounce my underſtanding, and proclaim Scripture to be utterly unintelligible, which were to be no Word of God.

---

§. 11.

YEt you have not done with me: for *pag.* 190. you fall on without fear or—— that the end may be like the beginning. You ſay, 1. *That the Papiſts aſſert no other works and condition to be neceſſary to our Juſtification and Salvation then what our adverſaries do.* 2. *Neither Papiſts nor Arminians do aſcribe any more Meritorioufneſs to Works then our opponents, &c. And in this ſenſe Mr.* Baxter *will tell you that the performers of a condition may be ſaid to merit the Reward. The Papiſts never pleaded for Merit upon any other account.*

Rep. 1. If this be true, our Divines are notorious liars and ſlanderers, ſo frequently to charge them with more. Which yet I had rather of the two believe of Mr. *Eyre* then of them, if I muſt needs do one. 2. If this be true, the Papiſts are notorious

notorious liars and ſlanderers, to wrong one another ſo much as they do, by affirming more of one another. 3. If this be true, doth not Mr. *Eyre* ſpeak better of the Papiſts then we are uſe to hear? and ſhould not all honeſt men be glad to hear that ſo great a part of Chriſtendome, are far better men then we took them for? 4. Doth not this intimate; Why may not the Papiſts be encouraged and have liberty in *England* as well as we, *R. B.* and a hundred Divines that ſay as much as he? Eſpecially if you compare this paſſage with what he ſaith to Mr. *W.* pag. 117. [*I dare ſay a more unſound Aſſertion cannot be picked out of the Writings either of Papiſts or Arminians then this is.*] And why then ſhould not we be reſpected alike, if we be corrupted alike? Whether he mean that we ſhould be reſtrained as they, I know not well; but by his Epiſtle to the Parliament it is liker he means that they ſhould have Liberty as well as we. You that are Mr. *Eyre* his neighbours, wrong him ſorely if you think him a friend to Popery, you may ſee the Papiſts will endure you to call Mr. *W.* and I, and all the Reformed Churches, Papiſts, if you will but open the door and let them in, and help them in weakning our hands and reſiſting us in the work of Chriſt.

You adde, " [Though Mr. *B.* ſeems to mince the matter, calling his conditi-
" ons but a *ſine qua non*, and a Pepper corn, *&c.* he attributes as much, if not more
" to Works then the Papiſts, Arminians and Socinians have done. The Papiſts
" will not ſay that Works do merit in a ſtrict and proper ſenſe.]

Rep. Prov. 19. 5. *A falſe witneſs ſhall not be unpuniſhed, and he that ſpeaketh lies ſhall not eſcape.* Though I delay this buſineſs purpoſely till I come to Mr. *Crandon*, yet I will give the Reader one word here before hand.

1. Out of one of their own; *Bellarmine* (Printed *Ingolſt.* 8° 1605) *pag.* 2567, 2568, &c. *cap.* 17. *l.* 5. *de Juſtific.* thus determineth this Queſtion [*Utrum opera bona ſint Meritoria ex condigno ratione pacti tantum? an ratione operis tantum? an ratione utriuſq;?*] *Media ſententia nobis videtur probabilior, quæ docet, Opera bona Juſtorum Meritoria eſſe vitæ æternæ ex condigno, ratione pacti & operis ſimul,* &c.] And *p.* 2571, 2572. he bringeth ſeven Arguments to prove that *in opere bono ex Gratia precedente, eſt quædam proportio & æqualitas ad præmium vitæ æternæ.* And *li.* 1. *c.* 21. *pag.* 2208, 2209. he endeavoureth to prove [*Meritum de congruo fundari in aliqua Dignitate operis potius quam in promiſſione.*] Judge now Reader, what credit is to be given to Mr. *Eyre*'s words? and how dangerous a thing this Antinomian conceit is, that ſin is all pardoned before we repent or are born. Durſt ſuch a pious man as this elſe over and over, even here on one page repeat in Print ſo notorious a falſhood? and ſay, [Neither Papiſts nor Arminians aſcribe any more Meritorioufneſs to Works] then we do? Nay that [I attribute as much, if not more to Works then the Papiſts.] Was *Bellarmine* no Papiſt? I deny all Merit to our Faith or Works; unleſs by the word [Merit] you mean ſomewhat that is not Merit. Doth *Bellarmine* do ſo? Nay he ſaith again here [The Papiſt never pleaded for Merit upon any other Account] then *ex pacto.* The Lord pardon this audacious falſhood to you Brother, and humble you for it.

2. But if *Bellarmine* be no Papiſt with you, what ſay you by *Aquinas*? See him 1. 2æ. *q.* 114. *art.* 1. *c.* & *art.* 3. *c.* [*Si conſideretur ſecundum operis ſubſtantiam & ſecundum quod procedit ex libero arbitrio, ſic non poteſt ibi eſſe condignitas propter maximam inæqualitatem: Sed eſt ibi congruitas propter quandam æqualitatem proportionis. Si autem loquamur de opere Meritorio ſecundum quod procedit ex gratia Spiritus ſancti, ſic eſt Meritorium vitæ æternæ ex condigno: ſic enim Valor meriti attenditur ſecundum virtutem Spiritus ſancti moventis nos in vitam æternam,* &c.]

3. The world knows that the Papists have commonly maintained (I say not, every man of them) the Merit of congruity, the very nature of which they ordinarily affirm to be from the respect of the work it self, and not from the Pact or Promise.

4. Our Divines commonly charge them with more. *Perkins* Reformed *Cathol. of Merit, Vol.* 1 *p.* 574, 545 saith, [The Popish Church placeth Merits within man, making two sorts thereof: the Merit of the person, and the Merit of the work: The Merit of the work is a dignity or excellency in the work, whereby it is made fit and enabled to deserve Life Everlasting for the doer: And Works, as they teach, are meritorious two waies. 1. By Covenant, because God hath made a promise of Reward to them. 2. By their own dignity: For Christ hath merited that our Works might merit: And this is the substance of their Doctrine.] So far *Perkins*.

I will adde no more, but leave it to the consideration of Mr. *Eyre*'s Church-members, whether for this publique sin, they ought not to admonish him, and desire him publiquely to profess his repentance? If not, let them at least see the evil fruits of his Doctrine, and that all his words are not to be believed Its scarce likely that he will make much more conscience of an untruth in the Pulpit, then in the Press; the later being the most publique, and therefore should be most advised and cautelous way of delivering our minds.

Yet he is at it again before he comes to the end of the same Page, saying, "[But "now Mr. *B.* goes a step beyond them, in that he ascribes a Meritoriousness to "Works, which the Arminians and Socinians have not dared to do.]

Rep. I am glad this is the last place where I find my self named. For I love not above all Writings to deal with those which are capable of no other Answer for substance, then that one *word* by which the fellow confuted all *Bellarmine*. Methinks it fouls my mouth, so much as to tell you what your words are; and it cannot but be unsavoury and unprofitable to the Reader; and therefore I shall say no more to you; but heartily desire the Lord to recover and forgive you, and to that end to make you ask forgiveness believingly and penitently, and to that end to convince you that you are guilty, till forgiveness come, and that no Infidels or Impenitent Rebels are forgiven: And I heartily desire, that if you preach this to your people, which you publish in this Book, the sad effects of it may never appear in their hearts and lives, but that Gods truth may lye neerer their hearts and prevail, and the face of your doctrine may not be seen in the face of your hearers conversation or your own.

FINIS.

Novemb. 26. 1653.

Reader,

VNderſtand, that for all the hot words between us, Mr. Eyre *and I are agreed, if he be a man to be believed. For* pag. 67. *he hath theſe words,* [However were the thing it ſelf granted, That there was in God from Everlaſting an Abſolute, Fixed and Immutable Will never to deal with his people according to their ſins, but to deal with them as Righteous perſons, this Controverſie were ended.]

Suppoſing that it is in regard of eternal puniſhment that he ſpeaks, and not of meer Legal Obligations, Convictions or Condemnations by Law, Conſcience, or men (in all which reſpects God deals not with the unrighteous as with righteous men) I do grant the whole, and here ſubſcribe my conceſſion: and ſo if Mr. E. *be a man of his word,* The Controverſie is Ended.

Rich. Baxter.

POSTSCRIPT.

READER,

BEcauſe Mr Eyre *hath the modeſty to alleadge* Mr Rutherfords *Judgement for his Opinion, I intreat thee to get and reade a full Volume of* Mr Rutherfords *(which I had forgotten when I cited thoſe words before) called* [A Survey of the Spiritual Antichriſt: opening the Secrets of Familiſm and Antinomianiſm, *againſt* Mr Saltmarſh, Mr Dell, Town, Dr Criſpe, H. Den, Eaton, *&c. in which is revealed the Riſe and Spring of Antinomians, Familiſts, Libertines,* &c.]

It is not only as againſt Mr Eyre's *Teſtimony that I deſire this of thee, but eſpecially becauſe it is one of the fulleſt Books that I know extant, againſt the Errors of this Sect; and very uſefull to the godly in theſe ſeducing times.*

READER,

SInce this Book was Printed I am able to give thee a more certain account of Mr *Crandon*'s Learned Examination of my *Aphoriſms:* If thou wouldſt know the Contents, I'le tell thee the main ſubſtance of this Book in one word, *viz.* [*That I am a Papiſt, and one of the worſer ſort of them too.*] This one diſh adorned with the flowers of *Billingsgate* Rhetorick, and ſawced with many hundred palpable falſhoods, is the precious feaſt which Mr *Eyre* hath invited thee to. But if thou think that I tell thee this for my own ends, and as envying thee ſuch felicity as the reading of his Volume, take thy courſe, and believe me when thou haſt tried, *Fiſher*, *Haggar*, *Reyes*, Mr *Eyre*, and all that have opened their mouths againſt me, are but meal-mouth'd fellows to this Mr *Crandon*. But if it work on thee as it did on me, thou wilt have ſome mirth at leaſt for thy money: For I confeſs I was not able to forbear laughter to ſee the ridiculous monſter come forth, and act ſuch a Tragedy before my face: Nor can I yet forbear when I caſt my eye on it, and think how ſeriouſly the man perſwades me that I am a Papiſt. But then remember that thy mirth muſt coſt thee ſorrow, as mine doth, when I conſider that I laugh at the ſignes of a mans miſery, and at that which diſcovereth our common depravedneſs, and the miſery of our poor people that muſt be both corrupted and diſtracted by ſuch Teachers as theſe. But if thou have a minde to learn Mr *Crandon*'s Ethicks, or Theology, take them and make thy beſt of them; but I pray thee expect not that ever I ſhould particularly Reply to it, till I have ſo much time that I know not how better to ſpend, or dare give an account to God of ſuch an expence of it, and till I am more inclined to ſtirre in ſuch a puddle as that is. If thou be not able to confute Mr *Crandon*'s ſtrong lines without my help, its not long of me, nor can I have while to help thee, though I pity thee: Yet leſt thou ſay I ſhift it off, I intend God willing, to give thee that which ſhall be the matter of an Anſwer, to the exceptions of him and many others, even a plain and full Confeſſion of my Faith, and eſpecially in the

Point

Point in queſtion: How much it is that I aſcribe to man or any of his actions in the work of Juſtification? with ſo much more againſt the main charges of Mr *Cr.* and Mr *Eyre*, as ſhall give thee cauſe enough to lament, that Opinion, Faction, and Paſſion, ſhould make Chriſtians ſo cruel to their own conſciences, as theſe men have been; and ſhall convince thee, that whatever they do by the reſt of the Law, the ninth Commandment is uſed but little better by them, then the ſecond is by the Papiſts. For all theſe crying ſins, I am in hope, by their zealous pretendings to the honour of Free-Grace, that they mean well in the main: And then I deſire thoſe that fear God to conſider, what crooked pieces the beſt of us are, what need we have of daily pardon of ſin, and what great cauſe to bear with abundance of darkneſs even in Teachers themſelves, and to put up many and great injuries from one another, if ever we expect any quietneſs to the Church: and not only to ſee that we forgive them our ſelves, but alſo to pray for them in imitation of our Lord, [*Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.*] And though Mr *Eyre* hath clawed his Brother with this commendations, that he is [*a faithful ſervant of Jeſus Chriſt, and a Workman that need not be aſhamed.*] Yet I intreat Mr *Cr.* to ſee that he be not hardened in impenitency by this warrant: For Mr *E.* cannot ſecure him hereby from future ſhame, though he may do ſomewhat to deſtroy the remnants of his preſent modeſty. If ſuch a maſs of Railing Accuſation, that is, Slander and Reviling twiſted together, be the work of [A Workman that need not be aſhamed] I confeſs I know not what men ſhould be aſhamed of; and muſt ſay, that ſuch men are not over-baſhfull. Indeed if there were no Law, and ſo no tranſgreſſion, they might prove that they need not be aſhamed: Or had they well proved that all their ſinne was perfectly pardoned before they were born, I ſhould yield that they need not be aſhamed, ſo far as ſhame is a puniſhment for ſinne: and therefore muſt ceaſe upon a perfect Remiſſion. But Impenicency and Impudency have no good foundation.

FINIS.